



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 30]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जुलाई 28, 1973/श्रावण 6, 1895

No. 30]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1973/SRAVANA 6, 1895

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके

Separate paging is given to this part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)
केंद्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गये विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities
(other than the Administration of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

आवृत्ति

नई दिल्ली, 20 जून, 1973

क्र. आ. 2064.—यसः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1971 में हुए पश्चिमी बंगाल विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 188-पंस्कुरा पश्चिम सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री एस. लियाकत, ग्राम कंठली पो. पंस्कुरा (आर. एस.) जिला मिडनापुर (पश्चिमी बंगाल) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा संबंधित बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री एस. लियाकत को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवृत्ति की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है।

[सं. प. ब.-वि. स./188/71(68)]

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

ORDER

New Delhi, the 20th June, 1973

S.O. 2064.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sk. Liaquat, Village Canpdali, P. O. Panskura, R. S. district Midnapore (West Bengal) a contesting candidate for election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 188-Panskura West constituency, held in March 1971 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

(2629)

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sk. Liaquat to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/188/71(68)]

आवृत्ति

क्र. आ. 2065.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए पश्चिम बंगाल विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 191-सामलुक निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मन्नागोबिन्द मन्ना, ग्राम भबानीपुर, पो. कल्याणचक, जिला मिदनापुर (पश्चिमी बंगाल) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री मन्नागोबिन्द मन्ना को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवृत्ति की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहिता घोषित करता है ।

[सं. प. ब.-वि. स./191/72(69)]

ORDER

S.O. 2065.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mangobinda Manna, Village Bhabanipur, P.O. Kalyanchak, District Midnapore (West Bengal) a contesting candidate for election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 191-Tamluk constituency held in March 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mangobinda Manna to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/191/72(69)]

आवृत्ति

क्र. आ. 2066.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1971 में हुए पश्चिमी बंगाल विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 205-देबरा सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से

चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री एस. अफजुद्दीन, ग्राम रामचन्द्रपुर, पो. भारोडाला, जिला मिदनापुर (पश्चिमी बंगाल) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री एस. अफजुद्दीन को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवृत्ति की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहिता घोषित करता है ।

[सं. प. ब.-वि. स./205/71(70)]

ORDER

S.O. 2066.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sk. Afajuddin, Village Ramchandrapur, P. O. Marotala, District Midnapur (West Bengal) a contesting candidate for election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 205-Debra constituency, held in March 1971 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sk. Afajuddin to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/205/71(70)]

आवृत्ति

क्र. आ. 2067.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1971 में हुए पश्चिमी बंगाल विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 214-वांतिन सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री केसब पारिथारी, ग्राम बरबाधरा, पो. वांतिन, जिला मिदनापुर (पश्चिमी बंगाल) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री केसब पारिथारी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा

विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और हाने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निर्वाचित घोषित करता है।

[सं. प. ब.-वि. स./214/71(71)]

ORDER

S.O. 2067.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kesab Pariari, Village Barabaghra, P.O. Dantan, District Midnapore (West Bengal) a contesting candidate for election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 214-Dantan constituency, held in March, 1971 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kesab Pariari to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/214/71(71)]

आदेश

क्र. आ. 2068.—यत्तः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए पश्चिम बंगाल विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 227-पाड़ा (अ. जा.) सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री गोपाल बाड़ी, ग्राम भगाईपुर, पो. सन्क, जिला पुरुलिया (पश्चिम बंगाल) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यत्तः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्बन्ध सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्यायित नहीं है,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री गोपाल बाड़ी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और हाने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निर्वाचित घोषित करता है।

[सं. प. ब.-वि. स./227/72(72)]

आदेश से,

ए. एन. सेन, सचिव

ORDER

S.O. 2068.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Gopal Bauri, Village Bhagaipur, P. O. Sanka, district Purulia (West Bengal), a contesting candidate for election to the West Bengal, Legislative Assembly from 227-para (SC) constituency, held in March, 1973 has failed to lodge an account of the election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Gopal Bauri to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/227/72(72)]

By Order,

A. N. SEN, Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(बैंकिंग विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 6 जून, 1973

क्र. आ. 2069.—भारतीय स्टेट बैंक (समनुवंगा बैंक) अधिनियम, 1959 (1959 का 38) की धारा 25 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (ड) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के परामर्श से, श्री वी. के. शृंगलु, उप-सचिव, वित्त मंत्रालय (बैंकिंग विभाग) को, श्री डी. के. सेन के स्थान पर स्टेट बैंक आफ इन्दौर का एक निदेशक नामनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं. फा. 9-3(1)/73-बी.ओ. 1(1)]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Banking)

New Delhi, 6th June, 1973

S.O. 2069.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (e) of sub-section (1) of Section 25 of the State Bank of India (Subsidiary Banks) Act, 1959 (38 of 1959), the Central Government in consultation with the State Bank of India, nominates Shri V. K. Shunglu, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Finance (Department of Banking), to be a director of the State Bank of Indore (vice Shri D. K. Sen.

[No. F. 9-3(1)/73-BO. I(1)]

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1973

क्र. आ. 2070.—भारतीय स्टेट बैंक अधिनियम, 1955 (1955 का 23) की धारा 19 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (ड) के निबंधनों के अनुसार, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एम. जी. बालसुब्रमण्यम, अवर सचिव, बैंकिंग विभाग को, श्री वी. एम. भीडे के स्थान पर भारतीय स्टेट बैंक का एक निदेशक नामनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं. एफ. 9-2(4)/73-बी.ओ. 1(1)]

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1973

S.O. 2070.—In terms of clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 19 of the State Bank of India Act, 1955 (23 of 1955) the Central Government hereby nominates Shri M. G. Balasubramanian, Additional Secretary, Department of Banking as a Director of the State Bank of India, vice Shri V. M. Bhide.

[No. F. 9-2(4)/73-BO. I(1)]

रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया

का० प्रा० 2071.—रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में जुलाई 1973 की 6 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा

इशू विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 1973

वेयताएँ	रुपये	रुपये	भास्तियाँ	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग से रखे हुए नोट	30,53,18,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलि- यन :— (क) भारत में रखा हुआ (ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ	182,53,08,000	
संचलन में नोट	5728,65,94,000		विदेशी प्रतिभूतियाँ	177,36,80,000	
			जोड़		359,89,88,000
जारी किये गये कुल नोट		5759,19,12,000	रुपये का सिक्का भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियाँ वशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य पत्र		7,57,73,000 5391,71,51,000
कुल वेयताएँ		5759,19,12,000	कुल भास्तियाँ		5759,19,12,000

6 जुलाई, 1973 को रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

वेयताएँ	रुपये	भास्तियाँ	रुपये
चुक्ता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	30,53,18,000
भारक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	4,34,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (बीर्षकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि	239,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का	2,89,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि	85,00,00,000	खरीदे गये और भुनाये गये बिल	
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (बीर्षकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि	205,00,00,000	(क) दशी	17,88,23,000
जमा राशियाँ :—		(ख) विदेशी	
(क) सरकारी		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल	216,29,34,000
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	51,01,15,000	विदेशों से रखा हुआ ऋण	271,40,44,000
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	7,49,49,000	निवेश**	590,46,36,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अधिम :—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	508,66,62,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	16,34,77,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को	109,58,94,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	1,04,28,000	ऋण और अधिम :—	
(iv) अन्य बैंक	1,32,08,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को	39,64,45,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को @	180,51,89,000
(ग) अन्य	205,17,04,000	(iii) दूसरों को	6,70,50,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (बीर्षकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि से	
देय बिल	26,67,73,000	ऋण, अधिम और निवेश	
अन्य वेयताएँ	336,48,94,000	(क) ऋण और अधिम :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	66,41,05,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	17,89,34,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त नियम को	34,50,00,000
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेचरों में निवेश	11,24,91,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और	
		अधिम राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अधिम	
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (बीर्षकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि से	40,40,57,000
		ऋण, अधिम और निवेश	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अधिम	129,09,36,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेचरों में निवेश	
		अन्य भास्तियाँ	75,56,31,000
रुपये	1838,22,10,000	रुपये	1838,22,10,000

*नकदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियाँ शामिल हैं।

**राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (बीर्षकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (बीर्षकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

@राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (बीर्षकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि से प्रवृत्त ऋण और अधिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परंतु राज्य सरकारों को दिये गये अस्थायी प्रोव्हीडेंट शामिल हैं।

रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17(4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को सीयादी बिलों पर अधिम दिये गये 12,60,00,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

@राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (बीर्षकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रवृत्त ऋण और अधिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

[सं० फ० 1(1)/73-वी० प्रो०-1]

एस० जनप्राथन

गवर्नर

ब० ब० सीरचन्दासी, अव्वर सचिव

तारीख : 11 जुलाई, 1973

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

S. O. 2071.—An Account pursuant to the RESERVE BANK OF INDIA ACT, 1934, for the week ended the 6th day of July 1973

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1973

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	30,53,18,000		Gold Coin and Bullion:—		
Notes in circulation	5728,65,94,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,08,000	
			(b) Held outside India	..	
			Foreign Securities	177,36,80,000	
Total Notes issued		5759,19,12,000			
			Rupee Coin		359,89,88,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		7,57,73,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		5391,71,51,000
Total Liabilities		5759,19,12,000	Total Assets		5759,19,12,000

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 6th July 1973

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	30,53,18,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	4,34,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	239,00,00,000	Small Coin	2,89,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	85,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted:—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	205,00,00,000	(a) Internal	17,88,23,000
Deposits:—		(b) External	
(a) Government		(c) Government Treasury Bills	216,29,34,000
(i) Central Government	51,01,15,000	Balances Held Abroad *	271,40,44,000
(ii) State Governments	7,49,49,000	Investments**	590,46,36,000
(b) Banks		Loans and Advances to:—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	508,66,62,000	(i) Central Government	
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	16,34,77,000	(ii) State Governments @	109,58,94,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,04,28,000	Loans and Advances to:—	
(iv) Other Banks	1,32,08,000	(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks †	39,64,45,000
(c) Others	205,17,04,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks ‡	180,51,89,000
Bills Payable	26,67,73,000	(iii) Others	6,70,50,000
Other Liabilities	336,48,94,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
		(i) State Governments	66,41,05,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	17,89,34,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	
		(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation	34,50,00,000
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank	11,24,91,000
		Debentures Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	40,40,57,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	129,09,36,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	
		Other Assets	75,56,31,000
	Rupees		Rupees
	1838,22,10,000		1838,22,10,000

* Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

** Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@ Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, But including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

† Includes Rs. 12,60,00,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4) (c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

‡ Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

[NO.F.1(1)/73-BO.1]

S. JAGANNATHAN,

Governor.

Dated, the 11th day of July, 1973

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, तारीख 2-9-72

आय-कर

का० आ० 2072—आय कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, बोर्ड की अधिसूचना सं० 79 (फा० सं० 55/278/68—आई टी (ए आई), तारीख 17-6-1969 और सं० 114 (फा० सं० 187/6/71—आई टी (ए आई), तारीख 15-4-1971 और सं० 217 (फा० सं० 187/6/71—आई टी (ए आई), तारीख 13-7-1971 द्वारा यथा संशोधित भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) के पृष्ठ 1454-1457 पर का०आ०सं० 1293 के रूप में प्रकाशित अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 20 (फा० सं० 55/1/72—आई टी), तारीख 30 अप्रैल, 1973 से सलग अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है :

क्रम सं० 15 के सामने स्तम्भ (1), (2) और (3) के अन्तर्गत विद्यमान प्रविष्टियाँ निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियों द्वारा प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी

आय कर आयुक्त	मुख्यालय	अधिकारिता
1	2	3
15-लखनऊ	लखनऊ	1. लखनऊ सर्किल I, 2. लखनऊ सर्किल II 3. बेतनसर्किल, लखनऊ 4. विशेष सर्किल, लखनऊ 5. संपदा शुल्क एवं आय कर सर्किल, लखनऊ 6. हरदोई 7. सीतापुर 8. गोंडा 9. फैजाबाद 10. नैनीताल 11. अल्मोड़ा 12. हल्द्वानी 13. काशीपुर 14. लखीमपुर-खेड़ी 15. इलाहाबाद 16. बेतन सर्किल, इलाहाबाद 17. संपदा शुल्क एवं आय कर सर्किल, इलाहाबाद 18. जौनपुर 19. सर्किल I, वाराणसी 20. सर्किल II, वाराणसी 21. मिर्जापुर 22. ब्राह्मगढ़ 23. बलिया 24. गोरखपुर 25. बस्ती 26. मुरादाबाद 27. रामपुर 28. बरेली 29. बदायूं 30. पीसी भीत 31. मुल्तान शहर

1

2

3

32. नजीबाबाद

33. शाहजहापुर

34-बन्वोसी—1

35-बहराइच—1

यह अधिसूचना तुरन्त प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 173]

बी० माधवन, अवसरसचिव

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 2nd September, 1972

INCOME-TAX

S. O. 2072—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the schedule appended to its Notification No. 20 (F.No.55/1/62-IT) dated the 30th April, 1963 published as S.O.No.1293 on pages 1454-1457 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3 sub-Sec. (ii) dated the 11th May, 1963 as amended by Board's Notifications No. 79(F.No.55/278/68-IT(AI) dated 17-6-1969 and No.114 (F.No.187/6/71-IT(AI) dated 15-4-1971 and No. 217 (F.No.187/6/71-IT(AI) dated 13-7-71.

The existing entries under columns (1), (2) and (3) against S.No. 15 shall be substituted by the following entries:—

Income-tax Commissioners	Headquarters.	Jurisdiction
1	2	3
15. Lucknow	Lucknow	1. Lucknow Circle I 2. Lucknow Circle II 3. Salary Circle, Lucknow, 4. Special Circle Lucknow 5. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Lucknow 6. Hardoi 7. Sitapur 8. Gonda 9. Faizabad 10. Nainital 11. Almora 12. Haldwani 13. Kashipur 14. Lakhimpur-Kheri 15. Allahabad 16. Salary Circle, Allahabad 17. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Allahabad 18. Jaunpur, 19. Circle I, Varanasi 20. Circle II, Varanasi 21. Mirzapur 22. Azamgarh 23. Ballia 24. Gorakhpur 25. Basti 26. Moradabad 27. Rampur 28. Bareilly 29. Budaun 30. Pilibhit 31. Bulandshahar 32. Najibabad 33. Shahjahanpur 34. Chandausi 35. Bahraich

This Notification shall come into force with immediate effect.

[No. 173]

B. MADHAVAN Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, तारीख, 9-5-73

प्राय-कर

का० प्रा० 2073.—प्राय कर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) तारीख 11 मई, 1963 के पृष्ठ 1454-1457 (अंग्रेजी में) पर का० प्रा० 1293 के रूप में प्रकाशित अपनी समय-समय पर यथा संशोधित अधिसूचना सं० 20 (फा० सं० 55/1/62 आई टी), तारीख 30-4-63 से सलग्न अनुसूची 6 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है

क्रम संख्या 4, 5, 5क, 5ख, 5ग, और 5घ के सामने स्तम्भ (1), (2) और (3) के अन्तर्गत विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएगी.—

प्राय कर प्रायुक्त	मुख्यालय	अधिकारिता
1	2	3
4. मुम्बई सिटी-I	मुम्बई	फिल्म सर्किल मुम्बई रिफण्ड सर्किल विवेशी अनुभाग वैतन ब्राच-I वैतन ब्राच-II सरपंचा मुल्क सर्किल कम्पनी सर्किल-I एक्स वार्ड, मुम्बई सर्किल अनिवासी रिफण्ड सर्किल
5. मुम्बई सिटी-II	मुम्बई	डी-I वार्ड डी-II वार्ड कम्पनी सर्किल-II
5क. मुम्बई सिटी-III	मुम्बई	ए-I वार्ड ए-II वार्ड ए-III वार्ड ए-IV वार्ड ए-V वार्ड कम्पनी सर्किल-III हुण्डी सर्किल
5ख. मुम्बई सिटी-IV	मुम्बई	सी-I वार्ड सी-II वार्ड सी-III वार्ड सी-IV वार्ड सी-V वार्ड निष्क्रान्त सर्किल-I और कम्पनी सर्किल-IV
5ग. मुम्बई सिटी-V	मुम्बई	बी-I वार्ड बी-II वार्ड बी-III वार्ड मार्फेट वार्ड ई-वार्ड निष्क्रान्त सर्किल-II और कम्पनी सर्किल-IV

1	2	3
5घ. मुम्बई सिटी-VI	मुम्बई	बी०एस०डी० (पूर्व) बी०एस०डी० (पश्चिम) जी०-वार्ड, जी ए-वार्ड, और कम्पनी सर्किल-VI

यह अधिसूचना 14 मई, 1973 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 345 (फा० सं० 187/9/73-आई टी/ए आई)]

New Delhi, the 9th May, 1973.

INCOME-TAX

S. O. 2073.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 134 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the Schedule appended to its Notification No.28(F.No.55/1/62-IT) dated 30-4-63 published as S.O.1263 on pages 1454-1457 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated the 11th May, 1963 as amended from time to time.

Existing entries under columns (1), (2) & (3) against Serial Nos. 4, 5, 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D shall be substituted by the following entries:—

Income-tax Commissioners	Head-quarters	Jurisdiction
4. Bombay City-I	Bombay	Film Circle Bombay Refund Circle Foreign Section. Salaries Branch-I Salaries Branch-II. Estate Duty Circle Com. Circle-I X-Ward, Bombay Circle Non-residents' Refund Circle
5. Bombay City-II	Bombay.	D-I Ward D-II Ward & Com Circle-II.
5A. Bombay City-III	Bombay	A-I Ward A-II Ward A-III Ward A-IV Ward A-V Ward Com. Circle-III Hundi Circle
5B. Bombay City-IV	Bombay.	C-I Ward C-II Ward C-III Ward C-IV Ward C-V Ward Evacuee Cir-I & Com Circle-IV
5C. Bombay City-V	Bombay	B-I Ward B-II Ward B-III Ward Market Ward E-Ward Evacuee Cir-II & Com Circle-V
5D. Bombay City-VI	Bombay.	B.S.D. (East) B.S.D. (West) G-Ward GA-Ward, & Com Circle-VI.

This Notification will take effect from 14th May, 1973.

[No. 345 (F. No. 187/9/73-IT/AD)]

आय-कर

क्र० प्र० 2074—आय कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और समय समय पर यथा संगोदित अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 223, तारीख 14-11-1972 के आंशिक उपान्तरण में, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड यह निदेश देता है कि तारीख 1-9-71 वाली उपर्युक्त अधिसूचना के उपाबन्ध 'क' में क्रम संख्या 1 और 2 के सामने स्तम्भ (2) और (3) की प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएगी :—

क्रम सं०	आय-कर आयुक्त	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त
1	2	3
1.	आयकर आयुक्त, मुम्बई सिटी—I मुम्बई आयकर आयुक्त, मुम्बई सिटी—III, मुम्बई आयकर आयुक्त, मुम्बई सिटी—IV मुम्बई	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त—I, मुम्बई ।
2.	आयकर आयुक्त, मुम्बई सिटी—II मुम्बई आयकर आयुक्त मुम्बई/सिटी—IV मुम्बई आयकर आयुक्त मुम्बई सिटी—VI मुम्बई	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त—II, मुम्बई ।

यह अधिसूचना 14-5-1973 से प्रभावी होगी ।

वी. बी. श्री निवासन, अपर सचिव
स० 346 (फा० सं० 187/9/73-IT/AI)

(INCOME TAX)

S. O. 2074—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in partial modification of their notification No.223 dated 14-11-1972, as amended from time to time the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that, in the Annexure 'A' to the aforesaid Notification dated 1-9-71 the entries under columns (2) and (3) against S.Nos. 1 and 2 shall be substituted by the following:—

Sr. No.	Commissioners of Income-tax	Additional Commissioners of Income-tax
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	C.I.T., Bombay City-I, Bombay. C.I.T., Bombay City-III, Bombay. C.I.T., Bombay City-V, Bombay.	Addl. C.I.T., I Bombay
2.	C.I.T., Bombay City-II, Bombay. C.I.T., Bombay City-IV, Bombay. C.I.T., Bombay City-VI, Bombay.	Addl. C.I.T., II Bombay

This Notification shall take effect from 14th May, 1973.
(No. 346 (F. No. 187/9/73-IT/AT)
(V.B. SRINIVASAN)
Under Secy.

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

(संयुक्त-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्वात का कार्यालय)

आवृत्ति

मद्रास, दिनांक 21-2-73

विषय :—लाइसेंस सं. पी./एस./1781293/सी.एक्स.एक्स/43/एम./33-34 दिनांक 23-5-1972 की सीमा शुल्क कार्य-सम्बन्धी प्रति रद्द करना ।

क्र. आ. 2075.—सर्वश्री नूर इंडस्ट्रीज, 48, मुफ्फसखान गार्डन स्ट्रीट, मद्रास को अप्रैल/मार्च, 1972 अवधि के लिये सामान्य मद्रा क्षेत्र से प्राकृतिक सुगन्धित

तेल, रीजनायड्स सिन्थेटिक सुगन्धित तेल के आयात लाइसेंस के लिये 5000 रु. का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी./एस./1781293/सी.एक्स.एक्स/43/एम./33-34 दिनांक 23-5-72 स्वीकृत किया गया था । फर्म ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमा-शुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल लाइसेंस बिना पंजीकृत करवाए और बिना उपयोग किए ही अस्थानस्थ हो गया है । इस तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र वांछित किया है ।

मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी प्रति खो गई है और आवेदक को उसीकी अनुलिपि प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिये ।

लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी प्रति एतद्द्वारा रद्द की जाती है ।

[संख्या : अगर/421/ए.एम. 72/एस. एस. आई.-1]

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF THE JT. CHIEF CONTROLLER OF IMPORTS & EXPORTS, MADRAS

ORDER

Madrass, the 21st February, 1973

Sub.—Cancellation of Customs Purposes copy of import licence bearing No. P/S/1781293/CXX/43/M/33-34 dated the 23rd May, 1972.

S.O. 2073.—M/s. Noor Industries, 46, Meffus Khan Garden Street, Madras-1, were issued a licence bearing No: P/S/1781293/CXX/43/M/33-34 dated the 23rd May 1972 for Rs. 5000/- for April /March 1972 period under General Currency Area for import of Natural Essential Oils, Resinoids and Synthetic Essential oils. The firm has applied for issue of the duplicate Customs purposes copy only on the ground that the original licence has been misplaced without having been utilised at all. In support of this contention, they have filed an affidavit.

I am satisfied that the Customs Purposes Copy of the original licence has been lost and a duplicate of the same may be issued to the firm.

The original Customs purposes copy of the licence in question is hereby cancelled.

[AM. 72/SSI.1.]

आवृत्ति

मद्रास, 28 मई, 1973

विषय :—अप्रैल/मार्च, 1973 अवधि के लिये 5000 रु. के लिये किए गए लाइसेंस संख्या : पी/एस/1781448/सी.एक्स.एक्स/44/एम/35-36, दिनांक 29-7-72 की सीमाशुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति को रद्द करना ।

क्र. आ. 2076.—सर्वश्री अम्मा कीमकल्स वर्क्स, नं. 1, इब्राहिमजी साहब स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-1 को अप्रैल/मार्च, 1973 अवधि के लिए सामान्य मद्रा क्षेत्र से सुगन्धित रसायनों, प्राकृतिक सुगन्धित तेल रीजनायड के आयात के लिये 5000/- रुपये का एक आयात लाइसेंस संख्या : पी/एस/1781448/सी.एक्स.एक्स/44/एम-35-36, दिनांक 29-7-72 स्वीकृत किया गया था । फर्म ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबन्धी प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल लाइसेंस बिल्कुल उपयोग किए बिना ही अस्थानस्थ हो गया है । इस तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र वांछित किया है ।

में संतुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी प्रतीत खाँ गई है और आवेदक को इसी की अनुलिपि प्रतीत जारी की जाए।

विषयाधीन लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी प्रतीत एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

[संख्या अगर/13/ए. एम-73/एस. आई-1]

एम. एफ. आर. बिजली, संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

Dated the 28th May, 1973

Sub:—Cancellation of Customs purposes copy of import licence bearing No. P.S/1781448/C/XX/44/M/35-36 dt. 29-7-72—for Rs. 5000/- for April/March 1973 period.

S.O. 2076.—Ammu Chemical Works, No. 1, Ubramjee Sahib Street, Madras-1, were issued a licence bearing No. P.S./ 1781448/C/XX/44/M/35-36 dt. 29-7-72 for Rs. 5000/- for April/March 1973 period under General Currency Area for import of Aromatic Chemicals, Natural Essential Oils and Resinoids. The firm have applied for issue of a duplicate copy of the Customs purposes copy of the licence only on the ground that the original licence has been misplaced without having been utilised at all. In support of this contention, they have filed an affidavit.

I am satisfied that the Customs purposes copy of the original licence has been lost and a duplicate of the same may be issued to the firm.

The original Customs purposes copy of the licence in question is hereby cancelled.

[Agar/13/AM-73/SSI-1]

M. F. R. BIJLI, Joint Chief Controller

आवृत्ति

नई दिल्ली, 22 जून, 1973

क्र. आ. 2077.—सर्वश्री एल्यूमीनियम मैन्युफैक्चरिंग कं., कलकत्ता द्वारा यह प्रतिवेदित किया गया है कि 4,83,000 रु. (चार लाख, तिरासी हजार रु. मात्र) के लागत बीमा भाड़ा मूल्य के लिये जारी किए गए आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी/डी/2184686/सी/एक्स एक्स/39/एच/31-32 दिनांक 29-7-71 का 3,27,306 रु. के लिये उपयोग करने के बावजूद और कलकत्ता (सीमा-शुल्क) कार्यालय में पंजीकृत कराने के बाद उस की सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रतीत खाँ गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

इस तर्क के समर्थन में सर्वश्री एल्यूमीनियम मैन्युफैक्चरिंग कं. लिमिटेड, कलकत्ता ने एक शपथ पत्र दिया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी इस से संतुष्ट है कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी प्रतीत खाँ गई है और निदेश देता है कि उन्हें अनुलिपि सीमा-शुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी प्रतीत जारी की जानी चाहिए। लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रतीत रद्द की जाती है।

लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमा-शुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी प्रतीत अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या मेटल/170/70-71/आर. एम.-5]

ज. शंकर, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd June, 1973

S.O. 2077.—It has been reported by M/s. Aluminium Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Calcutta that the Customs Purposes copy of Import Licence No. P/D/2184686/C/XX/39/H/49 G of I/73—2.

31-32 dated 29-7-1971 granted to them for a C.I.F. value of Rs. 4,83,000/- (Rupees Four Lakhs and Eighty three thousand only) has been lost/misplaced, having been utilised for Rs. 3,27,306/- (Rupees Three lakhs, Twenty Seven thousand, three hundred and six only) and registered with Calcutta (Custom House).

In support of this contention, M/s. Aluminium Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Calcutta have given an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Customs purposes copy of the licence has been lost/misplaced and direct that a duplicate licence for Customs purposes should be issued to them. The original Customs purposes copy of the licence is cancelled.

A duplicate customs purposes copy of the licence is being issued separately.

[No. Metal/170/70-71/RM-V]

J. SHANKAR, Dy. Chief Controller

विदेश मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 18 मई, 1973

क्र. आ. 2078.—संश्लेषित, मूल नियमों के नियम 45 में की गई व्यवस्था का अनुसरण करते हुए, एतत् द्वारा, होस्टल-आवास नियतन (विदेश मंत्रालय) नियम 1970 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं:—

1. (1) इन नियमों को होस्टल-आवास (विदेश मंत्रालय) संशोधन नियम, 1973 कहा जाएगा।

(2) राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तिथि से यह नियम लागू हो जाएंगे।

2. होस्टल-आवास (विदेश मंत्रालय) नियमों में:—

(1) नियम 3 के उप-नियम (2) (ग) और (3) में और नियम 8 के उपनियम (2) में प्रयुक्त शब्दों, "मंत्रालय में अपर सचिव" के स्थान पर शब्द, "मंत्रालय में प्रशासन कार्य देखने वाला सचिव या इस कार्य के लिए प्राधिकृत कोई अधिकारी" रख दिया जाएगा।

(2) नियम 8 के उपनियम, (4) में शब्द "अवर सचिव" रख स्थान पर "प्रशासन कार्य देखने वाला सचिव" रख दिया जाए।

(3) नियम 11 के उपनियम 3 में शब्द, "अवर सचिव" के स्थान पर "प्रशासन कार्य देखने वाला सचिव या इस कार्य के लिए प्राधिकृत कोई अन्य अधिकारी" रख दिया जाएगा।

[सं. क्यू/एस. ई./8601/175/72]

ए. दयाल, अपर सचिव

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 18th May, 1973

S.O. 2078.—In pursuance of the provisions of rule 45 of the Fundamental Rules, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Allotment of Hostel Accommodation (Ministry of External Affairs) Rules, 1970, namely:—

1. (i) These rules may be called the Allotment of Hostel Accommodation (Ministry of External Affairs) Amendment Rules, 1973.

(ii) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Allotment of Hostel Accommodation (Ministry of External Affairs) rules:—

(i) in sub-rules (2)(c) and (3) of Rule 3, and sub-rule (2) of Rule 6, for the words "Additional Secretary in the Ministry" the words "the Secretary dealing with Administration in the Ministry or any other officer authorised for the purpose" shall be substituted;

(ii) in sub-rule (4) of Rule 8, for the words "the Additional Secretary", the words "the Secretary dealing with Administration" shall be substituted, and

(iii) in sub-rule 3 of Rule 11, for the words "Additional Secretary" the words "the Secretary dealing with Administration or any other officer authorised for the purpose" shall be substituted.

[No. Q/SE/8601/175/72]

A. DAYAL, Under Secy.

औद्योगिक विकास, विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय

(भारतीय मानक संस्था)

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 1973

क्र० प्रा० 2079.—समय समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन बिन्दु) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि नीचे दिया लाइसेंस जिसके ध्येय अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, लाइसेंसधारी का कार्य असन्तोषजनक होने के कारण 18 मई 1973 से रद्द कर दिया गया है :

अनुसूची

लाइसेंस संख्या और तिथि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु प्रक्रिया	तत्संबंधी भारतीय मानक
सी एम एल-2573 3-3-1971	मेसर्स कृष्ण माइनर्स एंड ट्रेडर्स, 12, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, जयपुर पश्चिम (राजस्थान)	एलड्रिन पायसनीय तेज ब्रव	आई एस 1307-1958

[सं० एम डी डी/55 : 2573]

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 11 July, 1973

S. O. 2079—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations, 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby notifies that the licence, particulars of which are given below, has been cancelled with effect from 18 May 1973 as the performance of the licensee was unsatisfactory :

Licence No. and Date	Name and Address of the Licensee	Article/process covered by the licensee	Relevant Indian Standard
CM/L-2573 3-3-1971	M/s Krishna Milners & Traders, 12, Industrial Area, Jaipur West, (Rajasthan).	Aldrin Emulsifiable Concentrates.	IS:1307-1958.

[No. MDD/55 : 2573]

क्र० प्रा० 2080—समय समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन बिन्दु) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है

कि नीचे अनुसूची में जिन लाइसेंसों के ध्येय दिए गए हैं, वे लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा नाम में परिवर्तन किए जाने के कारण 30 अप्रैल 1973 से रद्द कर दिए गए हैं :

अनुसूची

लाइसेंस सं० और तिथि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु प्रक्रिया	तत्संबंधी भारतीय मानक
सी एम एल-803 26-10-64	मेसर्स प्रताप स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स, छेहरटा (पंजाब)	केवल निम्नलिखित सेक्शनो वाला सरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)	आई एस : 226-1969

(1) मुद्दु इस्पात के वर्ग, 14 मिमी तक और 28 मिमी से ऊपर व्यास वाले

(2) मुद्दु इस्पात के वर्ग 14 मिमी वर्ग तक और 28 मिमी वर्ग से ऊपर

(3) मुद्दु इस्पात की कोनिया फ्लैट इत्यादि 200 वर्ग मिमी तक आड़ी काट वाले

(4) मुद्दु इस्पात के गोले, 14 मिमी से ऊपर और 28 मिमी से नीचे व्यास वाले

सी एम एल-804 26-10-64	" "	केवल निम्नलिखित सेक्शनो वाला सरचना इस्पात (साधारण किस्म)	आई एस 1977-1969
--------------------------	-----	--	-----------------

(1) मुद्दु इस्पात के वर्ग 14 मिमी तक और 28 मिमी से ऊपर व्यास वाले

(2) मुद्दु इस्पात के वर्ग 14 मिमी वर्ग तक और 28 मिमी वर्ग से ऊपर

(3) मुद्दु इस्पात की कोनिया, फ्लैट इत्यादि 200 वर्ग मिमी तक आड़ी काट वाले

(4) मुद्दु इस्पात के गोले, 14 मिमी से ऊपर और 28 मिमी से नीचे व्यास वाले

सी एम एल-1084 1-6-65	मेसर्स प्रताप स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स, (पंजाब)	कंक्रीट प्रबलन के लिए मुद्दु इस्पात और मध्यम तनाव इस्पात की सरिया और सख्त खिंचे इस्पात के तार	आई एस : 432-1960
-------------------------	--	---	------------------

सी एम एल-1085 1-6-65	" "	सरचना इस्पात (गलन वेल्डिंग किस्म)	आई एस : 2062-1962
-------------------------	-----	-----------------------------------	-------------------

[सं० एम डी डी/55:803]

डि० वाम गुप्ता, निदेशक (मैट्रल मामल)

S. O. 2080.—In pursuance of Sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby notifies that the licences, particulars of which are given below, have been cancelled with effect from 30 April, 1973 as the name of the licensee has been changed:—

SCHEDULE

Licence No. & Date	Name and Address of the Licensee	Article/process covered by the Licence	Relevant Indian Standard
CM/L-803 26-10-1964	M/s Partial Steel Rolling Mills, Chheharta (Punjab)	Structural Steel (Standard Quality) of the following sections only:— (1) M.S. Rounds up to 14 mm dia and over 28 mm dia. (2) M.S. Squares up to 14 mm sq. and over 28 mm Square (3) M.S. Angles, Flats, etc. upto 200 Sq. mm cross-sectional area. (4) M.S. Rounds above 14 mm dia and below 28 mm dia.	IS:226-1969
CM/L-804 26-10-1964	-Do-	Structural Steel (Ordinary Quality) of the following sections only:— (1) M.S. Rounds up to 14 mm dia and over 28 mm dia. (2) M.S. Squares up to 14 mm Sq. and over 28 mm Square. (3) M.S. Angles, Flats, etc. upto 200 Sq. mm cross-sectional area. (4) M.S. Rounds above 14 mm dia and below 28 mm dia.	IS : 1977-1969
CM/L-1084 1-6-1965	-Do-	Mild steel and medium tensile steel bars and hard-drawn steel wire for concrete reinforcement.	IS:432-1960
CM/L-1085 1-6-1965	-Do-	Structural steel (fusion welding quality)	IS:2062-1962

No. MDD/55:803.

D. DAS GUPTA, Director (Central Marks),

पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय

(पेट्रोल विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 1973

का० प्रा० 2081—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित से यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में डी एम सं० बी ई यू से बी ई ए च (ए) से जी जी एस सं० 1 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वाक्य अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के सीधे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप समझ प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और वेल्डिंग प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड बरौदा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत: हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

बी ई यू से बी ई ए च (ए) से जी जी एस सं० 1 तक लाइन के लिए

गांव	सर्वेक्षण सं०	हक्टर	ए आई ई पी ए प्रार ई
	385	0	14 80
नौगांव	408	0	08 66
	409	0	01 68
	410	0	03 36
	412	0	10 12
	413/3	0	01 00
	414/2	0	03 14
	401/1†2	0	14 52
	642	0	11 12
	645 पी	0	03 60
	645 पी	0	07 32
	627	0	05 06
	626	0	10 36
	624/1	0	01 24
	525	0	04 80
	622	0	02 52
खारीहूरहर		0	02 20
काटे ट्रैक		0	02 34
	706	0	00 20
	738	0	09 42
	748/1	0	00 70
	747/1	0	03 44
	748/2	0	00 10

[सं० 12016/1/73(1) नेबर एंड सेजिस]

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS

(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi, the 9th July, 1973.

S. O. 2081.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D.S.No. BEU to BEH (A) to GGS No. 1 in Gujarat State, Pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission; Nawagam Project.

AND WHEREAS it appears that for the purpose of laying such Pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

PROVIDED THAT any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9.

AND every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

For Line From BEU TO BEH (A) TO GGS No. 1

State : Gujarat Distt. : Kaira Taluka : Matar

Village	S. No.	Hectare	Acre	P. Acre
Nawagan	385	0	14	80
	408	0	08	66
	409	0	01	68
	410	0	03	36
	412	0	10	12
	413/3	0	01	00
	414/2	0	03	14
	401/1+2	0	14	52
	642	0	11	12
	645 P.	0	03	60
	645 P.	0	07	32
	627	0	05	06
	626	0	10	36
	624/1	0	01	24
	625	0	04	80
	622	0	02	52
	Khari Canal	0	02	20
	Cart Track	0	02	34
	706	0	00	20
	738	0	09	42
	748/1	0	00	70
	747/1	0	03	44
	748/2	0	00	10

[No. 12016/1/73(1)/L & L]

क्र० आ० 2082.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में के-121 से जी जी एस VIII तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइप लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए ।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है ।

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है ।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप समक्ष प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुर रोड बरोडा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा ।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत ।

अनुसूची

के-121 से जी जी एस VIII तक पाइपलाइन

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : महसना तालु : कलोल

गांव	सर्वेक्षण सं०	हेक्टर	ए. आर. ई.	पी. ए. आर. ई.
कलोल	1218	0	14	13
	1217	0	6	95
	1183/2	0	3	29
	1182	0	4	27
	1181	0	3	66
	1179/1/6	0	4	27
	1179/2	0	7	32
	986	0	1	00
	987	0	8	05
	988	0	6	83
	989	0	10	98
	990	0	2	44
	996	0	7	69
	997	0	6	71
	999	0	3	66
	999	0	6	71
	940	0	13	42
	1000	0	1	22

[12016/1/(II) लेबर एंड लेजिस]

(बी, आर, भस्मा) अवर सचिव

S. O. 2082.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from K-121 to GGS VIII in Gujarat State, Pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission ;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such Pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

Now therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

PIPELINE FROM K-121 TO GGS VIII
STATE : GUJARAT DIST : MEHSANA TALUKA :
KALOL

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 1973

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Acre	P. Acre
KALOL	1218	0	14	15
	1217	0	6	95
	1183/2	0	3	29
	1182	0	4	27
	1181	0	3	66
	1179/1/6	0	4	27
	1179/2	0	7	32
	986	0	1	00
	987	0	8	05
	988	0	6	83
	989	0	10	98
	990	0	2	44
	996	0	7	69
	997	0	6	71
	999	0	3	66
	940	0	13	42
	1000	0	1	22

[No 12016/1/73(II)/L&L]
B. R. BHALLA, Under Secy,

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 1973

क्र. आ. 2083.—भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 11 की उप-धारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद् के परामर्श से एतद्द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की प्रथम अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है :—

उक्त अनुसूची में, आन्ध्र विश्वविद्यालय से संबंधित प्रविष्टि में मास्टर आव शल्य चिकित्सा (शरीर रचना विज्ञान). एम. एस. (आन्ध्र) आन्ध्र प्रविष्टि के बाद निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रख ली जाए :—

“डाक्टर आव मॉडिसन

(विकृति विज्ञान, जीवाणु विज्ञान सहित)—एम. डी.

(विकृति विज्ञान, जीवाणु विज्ञान सहित) आन्ध्र”

[सं. वी. 11015/7/73 एम. पी. टी.]

क. सती बालकृष्णा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1973

S.O.2083.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 11 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consulting the Medical Council of India, hereby makes the following amendment in the First Schedule to the said Act, namely:—

In the said Schedule, in the entries relating to the University of Andhra, after the entry “Master of Surgery (Anatomy)... M.S. (Ana.), Andhra”, the following entry shall be inserted, namely:—

“Doctor of Medicine (Pathology... M.D. (Path. incl. including Bact.) Bacteriology) Andhra”

[No. V. 11015/7/73-MPT]
K.M. SATHI BALAKRISHNA, Under Secy.

क्र. आ. 2084.—राष्ट्रपति, केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और प्रपील) नियम, 1965 के नियम 9 के उप-नियम (2), नियम 12 के उप-नियम (2) के खंड (ख) तथा नियम 24 के उप-नियम (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत सरकार के पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या क्र. आ. 2395, तारीख 2 सितम्बर, 1972 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करते हैं, अर्थात् :—

(i) उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में, भाग II साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, वर्ग III में, स्तम्भ 1 में “हवाई मार्ग और विमान क्षेत्र संगठन” प्रविष्टि के सामने स्तम्भ 3 से 5 तक की प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर क्रमशः निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियां रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“3	4	5
निदेशक, प्रशासन विमान- सभा		नागर विमानन महा- निदेशक
क्षेत्र नियंत्रक और विद्युत् (i) से (iv)		निदेशक निदेशक, एव यांत्रिक अधिकारी
		प्रशासन”

(ii) भाग III—साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, वर्ग IV में :—

(क) स्तम्भ 1 में “हवाई मार्ग और विमानक्षेत्र संगठन, विमान- क्षेत्र नियंत्रक का कार्यालय तथा अंतराजपत्रित अधिकारियों के भारसाधन में विमानक्षेत्र कार्यालय” प्रविष्टि के सामने स्तम्भ 2 से 5 तक की प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर, क्रमशः निम्न- लिखित प्रविष्टियां रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“2	3	4	5
विमानक्षेत्र नियंत्रक	विमानक्षेत्र नियंत्रक	सभी	निदेशक, प्रशासन”

(ख) स्तम्भ 1 की प्रविष्टि “केन्द्रीय परीक्षा संगठन सभी पद”

तथा स्तम्भ 2 से 5 तक की तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टियों का लोप कर दिया जाएगा।

[सं. सी. 11021/1/72-बी ई]

आत्मा राम गोयल, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF TOURISM & CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 7th July, 1973

S. O. 2084.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24, of the Central Civil Services (Classification Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, the President hereby makes the following amendments in the Notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation, No. S.O. 2395, dated the 2nd September, 1972, namely:—

(i) In the Schedule to the said notification, in part II—General Central Service, Class III, for the entries in column 3 to 5 against the entry “Air Routes & Aerodromes organisation” in column 1, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely:—

3	4	5
Director of Administration	All	Director General of Civil Aviation
Controller of Aerodromes & Electrical and Mechanical Officer	(i) to (iv)	Director of Administration

(ii) In Part III—General Central Service, Class IV:—

- (a) for the entries in columns 2 to 5 against entry "Air Routes & Aerodromes Organisation, Office of the Controller of Aerodromes and Aerodrome Offices in charge of non-gazetted officers" in column 1, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely:—

"2	3	4	5
Controller of Aerodromes	Controller of Aerodromes	All	Director of Administration

- (b) the entry "Central Examination Organisation all posts" in column 1 and the corresponding entries in columns 2 to 5 shall be omitted.

[No. C. 11021/1/72-VE]

A. R. GOEL, Under Secy.

सिंचाई और विद्युत् मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 13 जुलाई, 1973

क्र. आ. 2085.—भारतीय बिजली नियमावली 1956 के नियम 133 के उपनियम (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा यह निदेश देती है कि मैसर्स राष्ट्रीय कोयला विकास निगम लिमिटेड की झिंगुरडा कोयला खान पर आपन कास्ट खान में 3.3 के. वी. रूसी विद्युत् खनिज क्रम संख्या ई-610 माडल डब्ल्यू. ओ. ई. के. जी.-4.6 वी. के संयोजन में निम्नीलिखित उपस्करों :

"एक 40 के. वी. ए. 3.3 के. वी./230 वोल्ट, 3 फेज स्टार/स्टार रूस में निर्मित परिणामित क्रम संख्या 366552 टाइप टी. एम. 3, 40/3.3 टी. न्यूट्रल प्रकट किए हुए परन्तु भूसम्पर्कित नहीं ।" के प्रयोग के संबंध में उपर्युक्त नियमावली के

(एक) नियम 118 (ग) और

(दो) नियम 130

के प्रावधानों को वहां तक शिथिल किया जाए जहां तक उसका संबंध (1) 118(ग) के शिथिलीकरण में, विद्युत् रोधित गॉण न्यूट्रल के साथ 40 के. वी. ए. 3.3 के. वी./330 वोल्ट 3 फेज स्टार/स्टार परिणामित क्रम संख्या 366552 से शावल के भीतर प्रकाश के उद्देश्यों के लिए अभीष्ट सप्ताई प्रणाली का 133 वोल्ट पर फेज और न्यूट्रल के बीच प्रयोग किया जा सकता है, (2) नियम 130 के शिथिलीकरण में, 40 के. वी. ए., 3.3 के. वी./230 वोल्ट 3 फेज परिणामित क्रम न्यूट्रल प्वाइंट विद्युत् रोधित खा जा सकता है, से है ।

बशर्ते कि उल्लिखित शिथिलीकरण उस समय तक मान्य होगा जब तक कि मशीन खान में इस्तेमाल की जा रही है और जैसे ही मशीन खान से बाहर ले जायी जाती है, अपीक्षित सूचना खान सुरक्षा (विद्युत्) के उपनिदेशक द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार को दे दी जाएगी ।

[सं. बि.दां-6(6)/73]

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER ORDER

New Delhi, the 13th July, 1973

S.O. 2085.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of Rule 133 of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1956, the Central Government hereby directs that the provisions of:

- (i) Rule 118(c) and
(ii) Rule 130.

of the said rules shall be relaxed in respect of the use of the following apparatus in conjunction with one 3.3 KV Russian Electric Excavator Sl. No. E610 Model WO EKG-4.6 b.

"One 40 KVA 3.3KV/230 volts, 3 phase Star/Star transformer Russian made Sl. No. 366552 type TM 3, 40/3.3T. Neutral brought out but not earthed.

In the open cast mine at Jhingurda colliery of M/s. National Coal Development Corporation Limited, to the extent that (i) in relaxation of Rule 118(c) the system of supply intended for lighting purpose within the shovel from 40KVA 3.3 KV/230 volts 3 phase star/star transformer Sl. No. 366552 with insulated secondary neutral may be used at 133 volts between phase and neutral, (2) in relaxation of rule 130, the neutral point of 40 KVA, 3.3KV/230 volts 3 phase transformer may remain insulated.

Provided that the aforesaid relaxation shall be valid for such time as the said machine is in the use in the mine and due information shall be given to the Central Government through the Deputy Director of Mines Safety (Electrical) as soon as the machine is taken out of the mine.

This order may be withdrawn or amended if considered necessary in the interest of safety at a later date.

[No. EL. II 6(6)/73]

आदेश

क्र. आ. 2086.—भारतीय बिजली नियमावली 1956 के नियम 133 के उपनियम (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा यह निदेश देती है कि मैसर्स हिन्दुस्तान स्टील लि. की राजहार खान पर आपन कास्ट खान में एक 6600 वी रूसी विद्युत् खनिज माडल के. टी. 46 वी. के संयोजन में निम्नीलिखित उपस्करों :

"एक 20 के. वी. ए. 6600/220/127 वी.3 फेज स्टार/स्टार रूसी में निर्मित परिणामित क्रम संख्या 835496 टाइप 3 एम-20/10 टी न्यूट्रल प्रकट किए हुए परन्तु भूसम्पर्कित नहीं ।"

के प्रयोग के संबंध में उपर्युक्त नियमावली के (1) नियम 118(ग) और (2) नियम 130 के प्रावधानों को वहां तक शिथिल किया जाए जहां तक उसका सम्बन्ध (1) नियम 118(ग) के शिथिलीकरण में 20 के.वी.ए. 6600/220/127 वी 3 फेज स्टार/स्टार परिणामित क्रम संख्या 835496 से शावल के भीतर प्रकाश के उद्देश्यों के लिये प्रयोग करने के लिये अभीष्ट 127 वोल्ट प्रणाली, परिणामित में गॉण विद्युत् रोधकों के हाने के कारण प्रणाली की बोल्टता, फेज और विद्युत् रोधित न्यूट्रल के बीच में प्राप्त की जाती है और दो फेजों के बीच नहीं जैसा कि नियम 188(ग) में अपीक्षित है सप्ताई की 127 वोल्ट प्रणाली का विशेष रूप से विचार किया जाए तथा उसका प्रयोग किया जा सकता है और (2) नियम 130 के शिथिलत में 220 के.वी.ए. 6600/220/127 वी 3 फेज स्टार/स्टार परिणामित को विद्युत् रोधित रहने दिया जा सकता है, से है ।

बशर्ते कि उल्लिखित शिथिलीकरण उस समय तक मान्य होगा जब उपर्युक्त मशीन खान में इस्तेमाल की जा रही है, और जैसे ही मशीन खान से बाहर ले जाई जाती है, अपीक्षित सूचना खान सुरक्षा (विद्युत्) के उप-निदेशक द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार को दे दी जाएगी ।

बाद की तिथि में अगर सुरक्षा के हित में आवश्यक समझा जाए तो इस आदेश को वापस लिया जा सकता है या संशोधित किया जा सकता है ।

[सं. बि.दां-6(8)/72]

एल. आर. सूरी, उप-सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 13th July, 1973

S.O. 2086.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of 133 of the Indian Electricity Rule 1956, the Central Government hereby directs that the provisions of :

(i) Rule 118 (c) and

(ii) Rule 130.

of the said rules shall be relaxed in respect of the use of the following apparatus in conjunction with one 6600V Russian Electrical Excavator Model KT-4.6b :

"One 20 KVA 6600/220/127V 3 phase Star/Star Russian make transformer sl. no. 835496 type T3M-20/10T. Neutral brought out but not earthed."

In the opencast mine at Rajhara mine of M/s. Hindustan Steel Ltd., to the extent that (1) in relaxation of rule 118(c) the 127 volts system of supply intended for use for lighting purpose within the shovel from 20 KVA 6600/220/127V 3 phase star/star transformer sl. no. 835496, the transformer having the neutral of the secondary insulated and as such the voltage of the system being obtained between a phase and insulated neutral and not between phases as contemplated in rule 118(c) the 127 volts system of supply is specially considered and may be used and (2) in relaxation of rule 130, the neutral point of 20 KVA 6600/220/127V 3 phase star/star transformer may remain insulated.

Provided that the aforesaid relaxation shall be valid for such time as the said machine is in use in the mine and due information shall be given to the Central Government through the Deputy Director of Mines Safety (Electrical) as soon as the machine is taken out of the mine.

This order may be withdrawn or amended if considered necessary in the interest of safety at a later date.

[No. EI. II-6(8)/72]

L. R. SURI, Deputy Secy.

संचार विभाग

(डाक-तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 1973

क्र. आ. 2087.—स्थायी आदेश संख्या - - - - - स्थायी आदेश संख्या 827 दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड 3 के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने बिहार सर्किल के मुंगेर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से जुड़े हुए जगलपुर टेलीफोन केंद्र में दिनांक 16-8-73 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[सं. 5-28/73-पी. एच. बी.]

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(P & T Board)

New Delhi, the 18th July, 1973

S.O. 2087.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 16-8-1973 as the date on which the Measured Rate system will be introduced in Jamalpur Telephone Exchange connected with Monghyr telephone system, Bihar Circle.

[No. 5-28/73-PHB]

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1973

क्र. आ. 2088.—स्थायी आदेश संख्या - - - - - स्थायी आदेश संख्या 827, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड 3 के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने कंगानोर टेलीफोन केंद्र में दिनांक 1-9-1973 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[सं. 5-15/73-पी. एच. बी.]

ए. एस. वोहरा, सहायक महानिदेशक (पी. एच. बी.)

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1973

S.O. 2088.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 1-9-1973 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in CRANGANORE Telephone Exchange, Kerala Circle.

[No. 5-15/73-PHB]

A. S. VOHRA, Asstt. Director General (PHB).

श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय

(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 1973

क्र० प्रा० 2089.—यत कांड़ला पोर्ट ट्रस्ट, गांधी धाम (कच्छ) के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन मेवावाला मार्केट, कांड़ला कच्छ करती है, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यत उक्त नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के अधीन एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को माध्यस्थता के लिए निर्दिष्ट करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अन्तर्गत उक्त माध्यस्थता करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी है;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यस्थता करार को, एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 की

धारा 10-क के अधीन करार के बीच

पक्षकारों के नाम

1. कांड़ला पोर्ट ट्रस्ट डॉक पेटी सं० 50,

गांधी धाम, (कच्छ)

2. ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन, मेवावाला मार्केट,

कांड़ला (कच्छ)

नियोजक का प्रतिनिधित्व करने श्री जेड एस० भाला,

धाले

अध्यक्ष,

कांड़ला पोर्ट ट्रस्ट।

कर्मचारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने

धाले

श्री जी० बी० रेगे,

उप-अध्यक्ष,

ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन, कांड़ला-कच्छ।

पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद को श्री ए० टी० जाम्बरे पोठासीन अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय सरकार (औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 2, चौथी मंजिल, सीटी आईम बिल्डिंग, 298,

बाजारगेट स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट, बम्बई के माध्यस्थ के लिए, एतद्वारा निर्देशित करने का करार किया गया है :—

- (i) विनिश्चित विवादग्रस्त विषय : पत्तन और गोदी श्रमिकों संबंधी केन्द्रीय मजूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट और उस पर तथा अन्य संबंधित मामलों पर किये गये सरकार के निर्णयों और अखिल भारतीय पत्तन तथा गोदी श्रमिक फेडरेशन द्वारा उठाई गई मांगों और उन पर किए गये और विचार-विमर्श के सन्दर्भ में, मुख्य पत्तन के पत्तन और गोदी श्रमिकों से संबंधित निम्नलिखित विवादग्रस्त मामलों को औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन माध्यस्थ के लिए गुणादोष के आधार पर निर्णायक निर्देशित किये जाने का करार किया गया है :—

- (1) क्या सहायता प्राप्त औद्योगिक आवास योजना में अर्थ-सहायता के तत्व और अनुबंधी कारणों को ध्यान में रखते हुए सरकार द्वारा प्रस्तावित मानक मकानों के किराये की वसूली की दरों को, अर्थात्, जहाँ मूल बेतन 200 रुपये प्रतिमाह से कम है, वहाँ मूल बेतन का (परन्तु नगर प्रतिकर भत्ते का नहीं) 7½ प्रतिशत और जहाँ वह 200 रुपये प्रतिमाह या उससे अधिक है, वहाँ मूल बेतन का (परन्तु नगर प्रतिकर भत्ते का नहीं) 10% की दर से, घटाया जाना चाहिये और यदि हा, तो किस सीमा तक ;
- (2) क्या मुख्य पत्तनों के पत्तन और गोदी श्रमिकों संबंधी केन्द्रीय मजूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट के आधार पर सरकार द्वारा स्वीकृत किये गये संशोधित वेतनमानों में वेतन के लिए निर्धारण के मामलों में मजूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिश के अनुसार सरकार द्वारा मजूर की गई 11.80 रुपये प्रतिमाह की अन्तरिम सहायता या उसके भाग को ध्यान में रखा जाना चाहिये ;
- (3) क्या मकान किराया भत्ते और प्रतिकर भत्ते के प्रयोजन के लिए महंगाई भत्ते (अतिरिक्त महंगाई भत्ते और समय-समय पर महंगाई भत्ते में की गई वृद्धियों सहित), को अंशतः या पूर्णतः वेतन के रूप में माना जाना चाहिये ?

- (ii) विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण, 1. कांडला पोर्ट ट्रस्ट, डाक पेटी जिममें अंतर्बलित स्थापन संख्या 50, गोधीधाम—का उपक्रम का नाम और (कच्छ) पता भी सम्मिलित है।

2. ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन, मेवावाला मार्केट, कांडला (कच्छ)

- (iii) यदि कोई संघ प्रधानगत् कर्म-ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन, कारो का प्रतिनिधित्व करता मेवावाला मार्केट, कांडला (कच्छ) हो तो उसका नाम।

- (iv) प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित 3480 लगभग कर्मचारियों की कुल संख्या।

- (v) विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या 3480 संभाव्यतः प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मचारियों की प्राक्कलित संख्या।

यदि, मध्यस्थ अपनी नियुक्ति की तारीख से तीन मास की कालावधि भीतर पंचाट देने में समर्थ नहीं होता तो वह राहत के रूप में अन्तरिम सिफारिशें करने के लिए स्वतन्त्र होगा।

पक्षकारों के हस्ताक्षर

दिनांक 20 जून, 1973

ह०- जे० ए० भाला

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले:

अध्यक्ष

कांडला पोर्ट ट्रस्ट

श्रमिकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले:

ह०-

जी० बी० रेगे,

उपाध्यक्ष

ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन,

काण्डला

साक्षी :

1. ह०- आर० पी० भागवत,

सचिव,

काण्डला पोर्ट ट्रस्ट।

2. ह०- अपाध्य

[सं० एल-39013/1/73-पी०एंड०डी०(iv)]

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 11th July, 1973

S.O. 2089.—WHEREAS an industrial disputes exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kandla Port Trust, Gandhidham (Kutch) and their workmen as represented by the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Mewawala Market, Kandla (Kutch);

AND, WHEREAS, the said employers and their workmen have by a written agreement under sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration and have forwarded to the Central Government, under sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, a copy of the said arbitration agreement;

NOW, THEREFORE, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said agreement.

AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION 10A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947

between

Name of parties	1. Kandla Port Trust, Post Box No. 50, Gandhidham (Kutch).
	2. Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Mewawala Market, Kandla (Kutch).
Representing employer:	Shri Z. S. Jhala, Chairman, Kandla Port Trust.
Representing workmen:	Shri G. V. Rege, Vice-President, Transport & Dock Workers' Union.

Kandla—KUTCH

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following industrial disputes to the arbitration of Shri A. T. Zambre, Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, 4th floor, City Ice Building, 298, Bazargate Street, Fort, Bombay.

(i) Specific matters in disputes—In the context of the report of the Central Wage Board for Port & Dock Workers, the decisions of the Government thereon and other related matters, the demands raised by the All India Port & Dock Workers' Federation and the further discussions held on these, the following matters in dispute relating to Port & Dock workers of the Major Ports are agreed to be referred to arbitration under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for decision on merits:—

- (1) Whether and if so to what extent the rates for recovery of rent for standard houses proposed by Government, namely, 7½% of basic pay (and not City Compensatory allowance) where basic pay is less than Rs. 200/- per month and at the rate of 10% of basic pay (and not CCA) if it is Rs. 200/- per month or more, should be reduced taking into account the subsidy element in the Subsidised Industrial Housing Scheme and other relevant factors.
 - (2) Whether in the matter of fixation of pay in the revised scales accepted by the Government on the basis of the Central Wage Board Report for Port and Dock Workers at Major Ports, the interim relief of Rs. 11.80 per month or part thereof granted by Government as recommended by the Wage Board should be taken into account.
 - (3) Whether Dearness allowance (including additional dearness allowance and increase in D.A. from time to time) in part or full should be treated as pay for the purpose of House Rent allowance and Compensatory allowance ?
- (ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved.
- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Kandla Port Trust,
Post Box No. 50,
Ghandhidham (Kutch) | 2. Transport & Dock
Workers' Union,
Mewawala Market,
Kandla (Kutch). |
|--|---|
- (iii) Name of the Union, if any, representing the workmen in question.
- | |
|---|
| Transport & Dock Workers' Union,
Mewawala Market,
Kandla (Kutch). |
|---|
- (iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected.
- | |
|--------------------|
| 3480 approximately |
|--------------------|
- (v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute
- | |
|------|
| 3480 |
|------|

If the arbitrator is not able to give his award within a period of three months from the date of his appointment, he will be free to make interim recommendations by way of relief.

Signature of the parties

Dated the 20th June, 1973.

Representing employers Sd./- Z. S. JHALA
CHAIRMAN
Kandla Port Trust

Representing workmen Sd./-
(G. V. REGE)
Vice-President
Transport & Dock Workers' Union Kandla

Witness:

- (1) Sd./- R. P. Bhargava, Secretary, Kandla Port Trust.
- (2) Sd./- illeg ble.

[No. L-39013/1/73-P&D (IV)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 12 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2090.—यतः कांदला डॉक थ्रम बोर्ड और कांदला स्टेवोर्स एसोसिएशन के प्रबंधन से संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डॉक वर्कर्स यूनियन, न्यू कांदला करती है, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और यतः उक्त नियोजकों और कर्मचारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को माध्यस्थता के लिए निदेशित करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यस्थता करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यस्थता करार को एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

करार

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)

के बीच

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले : 1. कांदला डॉक थ्रम बोर्ड, कांदला।

2. कांदला स्टेवोर्स एसोसिएशन लि., कांदला।

कर्मचारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले : वि. ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डॉक वर्कर्स यूनियन, कांदला।

पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद को ए. टी. जाम्बू, पीठासीन अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, थ्रम न्यायालय संख्या 2, चौथी मंजिल, सिटी आईस बिल्डिंग, 298, बाजार गेट स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट बम्बई के माध्यस्थता के लिए निदेशित करने का एतद्वारा करार किया जाता है।

1. विनिर्दिष्ट विवादग्रस्त विषय :—पत्तन और गांधी श्रमिकों सम्बन्धी केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट और उस पर तथा अन्य संबंधित मामलों पर किए गए सरकार के निर्णयों, अखिल भारत पत्तन तथा गांधी श्रमिक फेडरेशन द्वारा उठाई गई मांगों और उन पर आगे किए गए विचार-विमर्श के सन्दर्भ में, मुख्य पत्तनों के पत्तन और गांधी श्रमिकों से संबंधित निम्नलिखित विवादग्रस्त मामलों का औद्योगिक अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन गुण दोषों के आधार पर निर्णयार्थ निदेशित किए जाने का करार किया गया है :—

- (1) क्या राष्‍ट्राय्‍य प्राप्त औद्योगिक आवा‍स योजना में आर्थिक सहायता के तत्‍व और अन्‍य संगत कारणों के ध्‍यान में रखते हुए, सरकार द्वारा प्रस्‍तावित मानक मकानों के किराये की बसुली की दरों को, अर्थात् जहां मूल वेतन 200 रुपये प्रतिमाह से कम है, वहां मूल वेतन का (परन्तु नगर प्रतिकर भत्ते का नहीं) 7-1/2 प्रतिशत और जहां तक यह 200 रु. प्रतिमाह या उससे अधिक है, वहां मूल वेतन का (परन्तु नगर प्रतिकर भत्ते का नहीं) 10 प्रतिशत की दर से, घटाया जाना चाहिए और यदि हां, तो किस सीमा तक।

(2) क्या मुख्य परस्मनों के पत्तन और गोवी श्रीमकों संबंधी केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट के आधार पर सरकार द्वारा स्वीकृत किए गए संशोधित वेतनमानों में वेतन के निर्धारण के मामलों में मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिश के अनुसार सरकार द्वारा मंजूर की गई 11.80 रु. प्रतिमाह की अन्तरिम सहायता या उसके भाग को ध्यान में रखा जाना चाहिए।

(3) क्या मकान किराये भत्ते और प्रतिकर भत्ते के प्रयोजन के लिए मंहगाई भत्ते (अतिरिक्त मंहगाई भत्ते सहित) और समय समय पर मंहगाई भत्ते में की गई वृद्धियों को अंशतः या पूर्णतः वेतन के रूप में माना जाना चाहिए ?

2. विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण :—1. कंदला डॉक श्रम बोर्ड, पोर्ट एंड कस्टम्स भवन, न्यू कंदला।

2. कंदला स्टेवेडोर्स एसोसिएशन लिमिटेड, कमरा संख्या 10, क्लीयरिंग एजेंट्स बिल्डिंग, न्यू कंदला।

3. संघ का नाम :—दि ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड वर्कर्स यूनियन, 20, मेवावाला मार्केट, न्यू कंदला।

4. प्रभावित उपक्रम में निर्धारित कर्मचारों की कुल संख्या :—कार्यालय कर्मचारी 20, पंजीकृत स्टेवेडोर कर्मकार 448 कुल लगभग 468।

5. विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या संभावित :—प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मचारों की प्राक्कलित संख्या : लगभग 468

यदि मध्यस्थ अपना पंचाट अपनी नियुक्ति की तारीख से तीन मास की कालावधि के भीतर देने में समर्थ नहीं होता तो वह राहत के रूप में अन्तरिम सिफारिशों करने के लिए स्वतंत्र होगा।

पक्षकारों के हस्ताक्षर

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले : 1. ह./जेड. एस. भाला अध्यक्ष, कंदला डॉक श्रम बोर्ड।

2. ह./आर. एन. राव प्रधान, कंदला स्टेवेडोर्स एसोसिएशन लि., कंदला।

कर्मचारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले : ह./जी. वी. रेगे उप-प्रधान, ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डॉक वर्कर्स यूनियन, कंदला।

साक्षी

1. ह./पी. एम. गुप्ते उपाध्यक्ष, कंदला डॉक श्रम बोर्ड

2. ह./के. पी. शाहानी, सहायक सचिव, कंदला डॉक श्रम बोर्ड।

[संख्या एल-39013/1/73-पी. एण्ड डी. (7)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 12th July, 1973

S.O. 2090.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kandla Dock Labour Board and Kandla Stevedores Association and their workmen as represented by the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, New Kandla;

And, whereas, the said employers and their workmen have by a written agreement under sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration and have forwarded to the Central Government, under sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, a copy of the said arbitration agreement;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said agreement.

AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION 10A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947

BETWEEN

Representing Employers :

1. Kandla Dock Labour Board, Kandla.

2. Kandla Stevedores Association Limited, Kandla.

Representing Workmen :

The Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Kandla.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following industrial dispute to the arbitration of Shri A. T. Zambre, Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Labour Court No. 2, 4th floor, City Ice Building, 298-Bazargate Street, Fort, Bombay.

(i) Specific matters in dispute.—In the context of the report of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers, the decisions of the Government thereon and other related matters, the demands raised by the All India Port & Dock Workers Federation and the further discussions held on these, the following matters in dispute relating to Port & Dock Workers of the Major Ports are agreed to be referred to arbitration under Section 10A of the ID Act, 1947 for decision on merits :—

(1) Whether and if so to what extent the rates for recovery of rent for standard houses proposed by Government, namely, 7-1/2 per cent of basic pay (and not City Compensatory Allowance) where basic pay is less than Rs. 200/- per month and at its rate of 10 per cent of basic pay (and not CCA) if it is Rs. 200/- per month or more, should be reduced taking into account the subsidy element in the Subsidised Industrial Housing Scheme and other relevant factors.

(2) Whether in the matter of fixation of pay in the revised scales accepted by the Government on the basis of the Central Wage Board Report for Port and Dock Workers at Major Ports, the interim relief of Rs. 11.80 per month or part thereof granted by Government as recommended by the Wage Board should be taken into account.

(3) Whether Dearness allowance (including additional dearness allowance) and increase in D. A. from time to time in part or full should be treated as pay for the purpose of House Rent allowance and Compensatory allowance?

(ii) Details of the parties to dispute :

1. Kandla Dock Labour Board, Port & Customs' Building, New Kandla.

2. Kandla Stevedores Association Ltd., Room No. 10, Clearing Agents' Building, New Kandla.

(iii) Name of the Union :

The Transport & Dock Workers' Union, 26, Mewawala Market, New Kandla

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected :

Office Staff	20	} Total : 468 approximately
Registered Stevedore Workers :	448	

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute :—

468 approximately

If the arbitrator is not able to give his award within a period of three months from the date of his appointment, he will be free to make interim recommendations by way of relief.

Signature of the parties.

Representing employers:

Sd/-
1. Z. S. Jhala, Chairman,
KANDLA DOCK LABOUR BOARD.

Sd/-
2. R. N. Rao, President,
KANDLA STEVEDORES ASSOCIATION LTD.
KANDLA.

Representing Workmen :

Sd/-
G. V. Rege, Vice President,
TRANSPORT & DOCK WORKERS' UNION,
KANDLA.

witnesses :

Sd/-
1. P. M. Gupte, Deputy Chairman
KANDLA DOCK LABOUR BOARD.

Sd/-
2. K. P. Shahani, Assistant Secy
KANDLA DOCK LABOUR BOARD

[No. L-39013/1/73-P&D (vii)]

नई दिल्ली, 13 जुलाई, 1973

क्र. आ. 2091.—डॉक कर्मकर (नियोजन व विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 5-क की उपधाराओं (1), (3) और (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री पी. सी. मित्रा, उपाध्यक्ष, कलकत्ता पत्तन आयुक्त, कलकत्ता को कलकत्ता गोदा श्रम बोर्ड के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है और उन्हें श्री के. के. रे के स्थान पर 3-7-1973 (अपराह्न) से उक्त बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष के रूप में मनोनीत करती है और भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का आ 1322 तारीख 7 अप्रैल, 1967 में और आगे निम्नीलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में :—

- (1) "केंद्रीय सरकार का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले सदस्य" शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत मद संख्या (1) से संबंधित प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नीलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जायेगी, अर्थात् :—

श्री पी. सी. मित्रा, उपाध्यक्ष, कलकत्ता पत्तन आयुक्त, कलकत्ता।

- (2) पैरा 2 में, "श्री के. के. रे, अध्यक्ष" शब्दों और वर्णों के स्थान पर "श्री पी. सी. मित्रा, उपाध्यक्ष" शब्दों और वर्णों को प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा।

श्रम और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या बी-12012/1/73-पी. एण्ड डी. के साथ संलग्न स्थायित्वक ज्ञापन।

श्री के. के. रे ने 3 जुलाई, 1973 (अपराह्न) को कलकत्ता गोदा श्रम बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष के पद का कार्यभार छोड़ दिया और श्री पी. सी. मित्रा, उपाध्यक्ष, कलकत्ता पत्तन आयुक्त, कलकत्ता ने उनका अध्यक्ष के पद का कार्यभार संभाल लिया। श्री पी. सी. मित्रा को, कलकत्ता पत्तन आयुक्तों के अध्यक्ष की हौसियत से,

3 जुलाई, 1973 (अपराह्न) से कलकत्ता गोदा श्रम बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष के रूप में नियुक्त किया जा रहा है। श्री पी. सी. मित्रा की नियुक्ति को इस प्रकार भूतलक्षी प्रभाव देने से किसी तीसरे व्यक्ति के हित पर कदाभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

[सं. बी-12012/1/73-पी. एण्ड डी.]

New Delhi, the 13th July, 1973

S.O. 2091.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (1), (3) and (4) of Section 5A of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. C. Mitra, Deputy Chairman, Calcutta Port Commissioners, Calcutta as a member of the Calcutta Dock Labour Board and nominates him as Chairman of the said Board with effect from the 3rd July, 1973 (Afternoon) vice Shri K. K. Ray and makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 1322, dated the 7th April, 1967, namely :—

In the said notification :—

- (1) Under the heading "Members representing the Central Govt.", for the entry relating to item (1), the following entry shall be substituted namely :—

Shri P. C. Mitra, Deputy Chairman, Calcutta Port Commissioners, Calcutta."

- (2) In paragraph 2, for the words and letters "Shri K. K. Ray, Chairman" the words and letters "Shri P. C. Mitra, Deputy Chairman" shall be substituted.

Explanatory memorandum to be appended to the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation.

Shri K. K. Ray relinquished charge of the post of Chairman, Calcutta Dock Labour Board on the 3rd July, 1973, (Afternoon) and Shri P. C. Mitra, Deputy Chairman, Calcutta Port Commissioners, Calcutta, took over charge of the post of Chairman from him. In his capacity as the Chairman, of the Calcutta Port Commissioners, Shri P. C. Mitra is being appointed as the Chairman, Calcutta Dock Labour Board with effect from the 3rd July, 1973 (Afternoon). No third person's interest would be adversely affected by giving such retrospective effect to the appointment of Shri P. C. Mitra.

[No. V. 12012/1/73-P&D.]

नई दिल्ली, 17 जुलाई, 1973

आदेश

क्र. आ. 2092.—यतः मोर्मगाओ पत्तन न्यास, मोर्मगाओ के प्रबंधन से संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व, मोर्मगाओ पत्तन और रेलवे श्रमिक संघ, मोर्मगाओ करता है, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है,

और यतः उक्त नियोजकों और कर्मचारियों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को माध्यस्थता के लिए निर्दिष्ट करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यस्थता करार की एक प्रति केंद्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है,

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केंद्रीय सरकार उक्त करार को एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन
कार के बीच

पक्षकारों के नाम :

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले.—मोर्मुगाओ के
पत्तन का न्यासी बोर्ड । प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले : श्री
आर. जे. मजीठिया, अध्यक्ष ।

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले.—मोर्मुगाओ पत्तन
और रेलवे श्रमिक संघ । प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले : श्री
मिगुएल ऐलफोंसो, अध्यक्ष ।

पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद को ए. टी.
जाम्ब्रे, पीठासीन अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण
एवं श्रम-न्यायालय संख्या 2, चौथी मंजिल, सिटी आइस बिल्डिंग,
298, बाजारगेट स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट बम्बई के माध्यस्थता के लिए निवे-
शित करने का एतद्द्वारा करार किया गया है ।

1. विनिर्दिष्ट विवाद-प्रस्त विषय :—पत्तन और गोदा श्रमिकों
सम्बन्धी केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट और उस पर तथा अन्य
संबंधित मामलों पर किए गए सरकार के निर्णयों, अखिल भारत
पत्तन तथा गोदा श्रमिक फेडरेशन द्वारा उठाई गई मांगों और
उन पर आगे किए गए विचार-विमर्श के सन्दर्भ में, मुख्य पक्षों
के पत्तन और गोदा श्रमिकों से संबंधित निम्नलिखित विवाद-
प्रस्त मामलों को औद्योगिक अधिनियम 1947 की धारा 10-क
के अधीन गृह-दोषों के आधार पर निर्णयार्थ निवेष्टित किए जाने
का करार किया गया है :—

(1) क्या साहाय्यप्राप्त औद्योगिक आवास योजना में
आर्थिक सहायता के तत्त्व और अन्य संगत कारणों को
ध्यान में रखते हुए सरकार द्वारा प्रस्तावित मानक मकानों
के किराए की वसूली की दरों को, अर्थात् जहां मूल
वैतन 200 रुपये प्रति-माह से कम है, वहां मूल वैतन का
(परन्तु नगर प्रतिकर भत्ते का नहीं) 7-1/2 प्रतिशत
और जहां यह 200 रुपये प्रतिमाह या उससे अधिक
है, वहां मूल वैतन का (परन्तु नगर प्रतिकर भत्ते का
नहीं) 10 प्रतिशत की दर से, घटाया जाना चाहिए और
चाहे हां, तो किस सीमा तक ।

(2) क्या मुख्य पक्षों के पत्तन और गोदा श्रमिकों संबंधी
केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड के आधार पर सरकार द्वारा स्वीकृत
किए गए संशोधित मानों में वैतन के निर्धारण के
मामले में मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिश के अनुसार सर-
कार द्वारा मंजूर की गई 11.80 रुपये प्रतिमाह की अंतिम
सहायता या उसके भाग को ध्यान में रखा जाना चाहिए ।

(3) क्या मकान किराये भत्ते और प्रतिकर भत्ते के प्रयो-
जन के लिए महंगाई भत्ते (अतिरिक्त महंगाई भत्ते
और समय-समय पर महंगाई भत्ते में की गई वृद्धियों
सहित) को अंशतः या पूर्णतः वैतन के रूप में माना
जाना चाहिए ?

2. विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण, जिसमें अन्तर्बलित
स्थापन या उपक्रम का नाम और पता भी सम्मिलित है :

(1) मोर्मुगाओ के पत्तन का न्यासी बोर्ड, मोर्मुगाओ-गोवा ।

(2) मोर्मुगाओ पत्तन और रेलवे श्रमिक संघ, वास्कोडेगामा—
गोवा ।

3. यदि कोई संघ प्रश्नगत कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व
करता है तो उसका नाम :

मोर्मुगाओ पत्तन और रेलवे श्रमिक संघ ।

4. प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजन कर्मकारों की कुल
संख्या : 2247

5. विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या संभावितः प्रभावित होने वाले
कर्मकारों की प्राक्कलित संख्या : 2247

यदि माध्यस्थ अपना पंचाट अपनी नियुक्ति की तारीख से तीन
मास की कालावधि के भीतर देने में समर्थ नहीं होता है तो वह
गृह के रूप में अन्तरिम सिफारिशें करने के लिए स्वतंत्र होगा ।

पक्षकारों के हस्ताक्षर :

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :

आर. जे. मजीठिया अध्यक्ष,
मोर्मुगाओ पत्तन न्यास ।

मोर्मुगाओ : 22 जून, 1973

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :

ह./-

मिगुएल ऐलफोंसो प्रधान,

मोर्मुगाओ पत्तन और रेलवे श्रमिक संघ ।

मोर्मुगाओ : 22 जून, 1973

साक्षी :—

1. ह./-के. ए. खान, आयोजक सचिव,
अखिल भारत पत्तन और गोदा श्रमिक फेडरेशन, बम्बई ।

2. ह./- आर. पी. क्लंकर, उप-परिरक्षक,
मोर्मुगाओ पत्तन न्यास, मोर्मुगाओ ।

[संख्या एल-39013/1/73-पी. एड डी. (8)]

टी. एस. कृष्णामूर्ति, अवसर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 17th July, 1973

S.O. 2092.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between
the employers in relation to the management of Mormugao
Port Trust, Mormugao and their workmen as represented by
the Mormugao Port & Railway Workers' Union, Mormugao;

And, whereas, the said employers and their workmen have
by a written agreement under sub-section (1) of section 10A
of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed
to refer the said dispute to arbitration and have forwarded
to the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section
10A of the said Act, a copy of the said arbitration agree-
ment;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section
10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby pub-
lishes the said agreement.

AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION 10A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947

BETWEEN

Name of parties :

Representing employers : The Board of Trustees of the
Port of Mormugao.

Represented by : Shri R. J. Majithia, Chairman.

Representing workmen : Mormugao Port & Railway
Workers' Union.

Represented by : Shri Miguel Alfonse, President.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the
following industrial dispute to the arbitration of Shri A. T.
Zambre, Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial
Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, 4th Floor, City Ice
Building, 298, Bazargate Street, Fort, Bombay.

(i) Specific matters in dispute—In the context of the report of the Central Wage Board for Port & Dock Workers, the decisions of the Government thereon and other related matters, the demands raised by the All India Port & Dock Workers' Federation and the further discussions held on these, the following matters in dispute relating to Port & Dock Workers of the Major Ports are agreed to be referred to arbitration under Section 10A of the ID Act, 1947 for decision on merits :—

(1) Whether and if so to what extent the rates for recovery of rent for standard houses proposed by Government, namely, 7-1/2 per cent of basic pay (and not City Compensatory Allowance) where basic pay is less than Rs. 200/- per month and at the rate of 10 per cent of basic pay (and not CCO) if it is Rs. 200/- per month or more, should be reduced taking into account the subsidy element in the Subsidised Industrial Housing Scheme and other relevant factors.

(2) Whether in the matter of fixation of pay in the revised scales accepted by the Government on the basis of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers at Major Ports, the interim relief of Rs. 11.80 per month or part thereof granted by Government as recommended by the Wage Board should be taken into account.

(3) Whether Dearness allowance (including additional dearness allowance and increase in D.A. from time to time) in part or full should be treated as pay for the purpose of House Rent allowance and Compensatory Allowance?

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the names and addresses of the establishment or undertaking involved :

(1) The Board of Trustees of the Port of Mormugao, Mormugao-Goa.

(2) Mormugao Port & Railway Workers' Union, Vasco da Gama—Goa.

(iii) Names of the union, if any, representing the workmen in question :

Mormugao Port & Railway Workers' Union.

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected :

2247.

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute.

2247.

If the arbitrator is not able to give his award within a period of three months from the date of his appointment, he will be free to make interim recommendations by way of relief.

Signature of the parties :

Representing employers.

Sd/-

R. J. MAJITHIA, Chairman.
Mormugao Port Trust.

Mormugao. 22nd June, 1973.

Representing workmen :

Sd/-

MIGUEL ALFONSO, President,
Mormugao Port & Railway Workers' Union

Mormugao : 22nd June, 1973.

Witnesses :—

(1) Sd/- K. A. Khan
K. A. Khan,
Organising Secretary,
All India Port & Dock Workers Federation,
Bombay.

(2) Sd/- R. P. Kelkar
R. P. Kelkar,
Deputy Conservator,
Mormugao Port Trust, Mormugao.

[No. L-39013/1/73-P&D(viii)]

S.O. 2093.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Superintendence Company of India (Private) Limited, Calcutta and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7th July, 1973.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 72 of 1972

Parties:

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs Superintendence Company of India (Private) Limited, Calcutta.

and

Their Workmen.

Present:

Sri S. N. Bagchi—Presiding Officer.

Appearances :

On behalf of Employers—Sri Nikhil Ranjan Roy, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Sri D. P. Kundu, Advocate.

State : West Bengal.

AWARD

By Order No. L-32011/21/72-P&D dated 16th December, 1972, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Superintendence Company of India (Private), Limited, Calcutta, and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely:

- "1. Whether the demand of the workmen for fixation of wages as per the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port & Dock Workers is justified? If not, to what relief are they entitled?
2. Whether the action of the management in retrenching 16 supervisors and 1 clerk as shown in the agreement dated 13th September, 1972, is justified? If not to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

2. The management appeared through the learned Advocate Sri Nikhil Ranjan Roy and the workmen through Sri D. P. Kundu, Advocate. The management in their statement of case raised a preliminary point as to the entertainability of this reference by this tribunal as the dispute, referred to for adjudication in the two issues, raised by the workmen does not concern an industry falling within Section 2(a)(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act and as such the Central Government is not the appropriate Government to refer the dispute in the issues in the order of reference for adjudication by the Central Government Industrial Tribunal at Calcutta. So, the learned Advocate appearing for the management urged that this preliminary point as to the jurisdiction of this tribunal to entertain and to adjudicate upon the dispute under reference should first be decided to which the learned Advocate appearing for the workmen agreed.

3. Messrs Superintendent Co. of India (Private) Ltd., is an incorporated body under the Companies Act, 1956, having its registered office at 46C, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-16 and having branches at different parts of India and also outside India. The said company carries on business of inspection and survey of all kinds of commodities and goods in the fields of Engineering, Metallurgy, Ores, Minerals, Chemicals, Textiles, Refractories, Oils, Food Products, etc., and also undertakes valuation jobs and marine survey. The company employs various categories of staff and workers for the purpose of the business of the Company and the employees are divided in various categories namely, Accounts staff, Engineering Staff,

Chemists, Laboratory Assistants, Laboratory Boys, Jute Inspectors & Raw Jute Exports, Valuers, Surveyors, Office Assistants and Departmental Incharges, Clerks, Typists, Stenographers, Supervisors, Peons and Casual unskilled workmen. The Company has no workmen in its employ who may be described or comes under the definition of "Dock Workers" as defined in the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 or any of the relevant Act. In Paragraph 5(a) of the statement of case it is stated that the employees employed are not Dock Workers as defined under the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 and the alleged industrial dispute which has been referred to the Central Government Tribunal for adjudication is not an industrial dispute concerning a Major Port. In the circumstances the appropriate Government as defined and mentioned in Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is the State Government of West Bengal and the industrial dispute, if any, which could be referred to for adjudication could only be referred to by the State Government of West Bengal. The Central Government is not the appropriate Government in the instant case and is not entitled to refer the alleged dispute for adjudication before this Hon'ble Tribunal. The company craved reference to the previous references which had been made under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as regards the dispute between the company and its workmen which were all referred for adjudication by the State Government of West Bengal in support of the said contention. In paragraph 5(b) of the statement of case it is stated that the Company has branches all over India and also outside India and there are workmen of the company employed in the said branches and there is no dispute between the employees and workmen of the company employed in the said branches and the company and as such the purported reference under Sec. 10(1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is bad as the present reference purports to be made applicable to all workmen of the company all over India and even outside and the company contends that in such an event the National Tribunal constituted under Section 10(1A) is only competent to adjudicate the alleged dispute assuming but not admitting that the Central Government is the appropriate Government in that case.

4. It is not necessary for determining the jurisdiction of this tribunal to entertain and adjudicate upon the dispute to analyse the statement of case submitted by the workmen. The jurisdiction depends upon the order of reference and the inherent classified character of the industry and the workmen employed in such industry. Section 2(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act speaks of appropriate Government and in clauses (i) and (ii) the appropriate is the Central Government in relation to any industrial dispute concerning the industries specified in clause (i) while in relation to any other industrial dispute that means that does not concern the industries specified in clause (i) the State Government is the appropriate Government. In relation to any industrial dispute concerning the industries specified in clause (i) of Section 2(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act the appropriate Government i.e. the Central Government can refer such disputes for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal i.e. this tribunal situated at Calcutta. But in relation to any industrial dispute that does not concern any of those industries as specified in clause (i) the appropriate Government is the State Government competent to refer industrial dispute to the State Tribunal. The industry, as the employer asserts, carries on business of inspection and survey of all kinds of commodities and goods in the fields of Engineering, Metallurgy, Ores, Minerals, Chemicals, Textiles, Refractories, Oils, Food Products and also undertakes valuation jobs and marine survey. The workmen are not employed in either Engineering or Metallurgy or Ores or Minerals or Chemicals or Textiles or Refractories or Oils or Food Products industry. The company carries on business of inspection and survey of all kinds of commodities and goods in the fields of Engineering, Metallurgy, Ores, Minerals, Chemicals, Textiles, Refractories, Oils, Food Products, etc. as specified in paragraph 2 of the statement of case filed by the employer but none of the workmen are employed by the employer in any of such industries as mentioned above. The workmen are employed in the employer's business of inspection and survey of all kinds of commodities and goods which may be Engineering goods, Metallurgical goods, Ores, Minerals, Chemicals, Textiles, Refractories, Oils or food products processed and manufactured by each individual industry concerning Engineering, Metallurgy, Ores, Minerals, Chemicals, Textiles, Refractories, Oils, Food Products. Only the finished goods produced by those industries are inspected and surveyed by the employer's workmen and

the employers also engages workmen in the valuation of various goods as well as in marine survey. So, the industry is of inspection, valuation and survey of all kinds of commodities and goods as either processed or manufactured by different industries as mentioned above. Therefore, none of the workmen is employed either in Engineering Industry, or in Metallurgical industry, or in Mining industry or Ore mining and processing industry or in Minerals mining and processing industry or in chemical industry or in textile industry or in the industry in refractories or in oil industry or in food processing industry. Therefore, the industry in which the workmen are employed in this case is not any one of the industries specified in Section 2(a)(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act. So, the learned Advocate for the management submitted that the dispute in the issues referred to for adjudication can only be referred to, in view of Section 2(a)(ii) of the Act to the Industrial Tribunal of the State Government by the State Government of West Bengal but not to the Industrial Tribunal of the Central Government by the Central Government which is not the appropriate Government. There is a categorical statement in the management's statement of case that previous disputes between the employer in this case and its workmen had been referred to under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act for adjudication by the State Government of West Bengal to State Industrial Tribunal in West Bengal. This fact could not be assailed by the learned Advocate appearing for the workmen. Now, the learned Advocate appearing for the workmen submitted that as the business of inspection and survey of all kinds of commodities and goods particularly in Ores and Minerals was being done by the company through the workmen as well as of valuation of products of Engineering, Metallurgy, Ores, Minerals, Chemicals, Textiles, Refractories, Oils and Food products as well as marine survey, the business of inspection, survey and valuation and marine survey thus carried on by the company fell within the expression "in relation to any industrial dispute concerning a mine or a major port" as occurring in Section 2(a)(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act, and that the reference of the dispute to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal by the Central Government was justified.

5. The expression "in relation to an industrial dispute concerning a mine" has been explained in *Serajuddin's case* particularly the expression "concerning a mine", reported in 1962 1 LLJ, p. 450, Sc. There the expression "concerning a mine" in Section 2(a)(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act was explained. The concern in *Serajuddin's case* was engaged in the business of carrying on mining operations in the State of Orissa and had its head office at Calcutta. The staff employed by the concern at the head office at Calcutta looked after the general control of the mines and the sale of its mine products. Separate staff was employed at the mines site for supervising the work of mining operations. Certain disputes arose between the workmen employed at the head office and the management in regard to certain service conditions. The State Government of West Bengal referred the said dispute for adjudication to the State's industrial tribunal. The validity of the said reference was challenged in the case of *Serajuddin & Company* on the ground that the appropriate Government under S. 2(a)(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act in respect of the disputes in question was the Central Government, and not the State Government of West Bengal. Negating the said contention their Lordships of the Supreme Court held, "In construing the expression 'industrial dispute concerning a mine' occurring in S. 2(a)(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act, it must be first determined what a mine means and this must be done without reference to the broad definition of industry prescribed by S. 2(j) of the Act. In the light of the dictionary meaning of the word 'mine' or in the light of the word 'mine' contained in S. 2(j) of the Mines Act 35 of 1952, there could be no difficulty in holding that an industrial dispute between the employees engaged in the head office at Calcutta and the employer is not an industrial dispute concerning a mine. The head office could not be considered as integral part of mine. It is obvious that persons employed in the head office, wherever it might be situated, could not be said to do the mining operation within the first part of the definition of 'person employed' in S. 2(j) of the Mines Act. Further, they could not be said to be ordinarily engaged in any other kind of work which is incidental or connected with mining operations either. The work which is incidental to or connected with mining operation must have some connexion with mining or in relation to the mining operations themselves. The work that was carried on in the head office in the instant case which consisted principally of the sale operations really began after the minerals were ready and all operations incidental to or connected with them were over. This is the principle which

should weigh with this tribunal to determine whether the dispute referred to for adjudication falls within the expression "in relation to any industrial dispute concerning a mine ... or major port". Now, Mr. Kundu, the learned Advocate for the workmen frankly submitted that the workmen were not governed by the Calcutta Dock Clerical and Supervisory (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1970. The employer, i.e. the company is not a "Dock employer". The workmen are not "registered dock clerical or supervisory staff." The employer is not also a "registered employer" and the workmen are not also Dock clerical and supervisory workers listed in Register C. In other words, Mr. Kundu frankly submitted that the workmen are not coming within the Calcutta Dock, Clerical and Supervisory (Regulation of Employment Scheme, 1970. So, the workmen are not employed in any "dock work" by a registered dock employer and they are not workmen employed in major port. Accordingly, the dispute referred to in Issue No. 1 as constituted is not in relation to any industrial dispute concerning a "major port". Mr. Kundu further submitted that Issue No. 1 could not be pressed for being entertained and adjudicated upon by this tribunal. In regard to issue No. 2, referred to for adjudication, the learned Advocate for the management submitted that the company's business of inspection and survey of all kinds of commodities and goods in the fields of Engineering, Metallurgy, Ores, Minerals, Chemicals, Textiles, Refractories, Oils and Food Products as well as valuation of those products and marine survey could not come within the expression "in relation to any industrial dispute concerning either a mine or a major port", and that as such the dispute referred to for adjudication in issue No. 2 could only come within the expression "in relation to any other industrial dispute" in Section 2(a)(ii) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Mr. Kundu submitted that as the business of inspection, survey and valuation of Ores and Minerals was carried on by the employer, engaging the workmen employed in this dispute, the dispute would come within the expression "in relation to any industrial dispute concerning a mine", as occurring in Sec. 2(a)(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Following the principles laid down in Serajuddin's case I could not accept such submission. On the other hand, the management's assertion in the statement of case that previous disputes between the company i.e. the employer and the workmen of the company had been referred to for adjudication by the State Government to the State tribunal could not be controverted by Mr. Kundu, the learned Advocate appearing for the workmen. The workmen involved in this dispute are not employed in the industry of any mine or in the industry of any major port. All commodities that have been manufactured and have come out as finished products from relevant industries manufacturing and/or processing the same commodities, the company carries on business, undertaking to inspect and/or survey and/or value different kinds of commodities manufactured and/or processed by the particular industry such as, Engineering, Metallurgical, Ore mining, Mineral mining, Chemical, Textiles, Refractories, Oils, Food Products, etc. So, the workmen are not employed in either of those industries such as Engineering, Metallurgy, Ore mining, Mineral mining and processing, Chemical producing, Textile manufacturing, Refractories, Oil, Food Products, etc. but they are employed in a business of the employer of inspection survey, valuation of finished goods produced by any of those particular industries. Therefore, the dispute between the company and the workmen in issue No. 2 does not relate to or concern an industry which might, by any stretch of imagination, come, within any of those industries enumerated in Section 2(a)(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Therefore, in relation to the dispute referred to for adjudication in the issue No. 2, the appropriate Government in Section 2(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act is not the Central Government but the State Government. The Central Government is not, therefore, the appropriate Government competent to refer the dispute in the issue No. 2 for adjudication by this tribunal since it does not relate to any industrial dispute concerning either a mine or a major port. Mr. Kundu frankly submitted that the dispute in the issue No. 1 referred to for adjudication should not have been referred to for adjudication by the tribunal as the workmen are not covered by the Calcutta Dock Clerical and Supervisory Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1970. As regards issue No. 2, as I find that if it could have been referred to for adjudication as an industrial dispute, it should have been referred to for adjudication by the State Government to the State Tribunal. This tribunal cannot, in view of Section 2(a)(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act, as applicable to the admitted facts of the present case, has no jurisdiction to entertain the dispute as referred to for adjudication by

this tribunal since the "appropriate Government" competent to refer the dispute for adjudication by a tribunal is not the Central Government but the State Government so far as issue No. 2 referred to for adjudication is concerned. So far as the issue No. 1 the workmen's representative submitted that the workmen had no case to press:

6. For all these reasons, I hold that this tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain and adjudicate upon the dispute referred to in issue Nos. 1 and 2 for adjudication by the Central Government to this Central Government Industrial Tribunal at Calcutta. I accordingly reject the reference.

This is my award.

S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-32011/21/72/P&D]

T. S. KRISHNAMURTHI, Under Secy.

Dated, June 26, 1973.

New Delhi, the 13th July, 1973

S.O. 2094.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chinakuri No. 3 Pits Colliery of Messrs. Bengal Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7th July, 1973.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 49 of 1972

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Chinakuri No. 3 Pits Colliery of Messrs. Bengal Coal Company Limited,

AND

Their Workmen.

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi, Presiding Officer.

Appearance :

On behalf of Employers—Sri D. Narsingh, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Absent.

State : West Bengal.

Industry : Coal Mine.

AWARD

By Order No. L/1912/51/72-LR11, dated 3-8-1972, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Chinakuri No. 3 Pits Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely :

"Whether the demand of the Union that loaders of Chinakuri No. 3 Pit Colliery of Messrs. Bengal Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan, should not be forced to do the jobs of dressing, drilling and explosive carrying besides their job of loading is justified? If not, to what relief are the loaders concerned entitled and from which date?"

2. In this reference case on the date of hearing the management appeared but none of the workmen involved in the case nor any representative of the workmen appeared. The dispute referred to for adjudication was espoused on behalf of the workmen involved in this dispute by Colliery Mazdoor Congress (C.R.), Ushagram, P.O. Asansol, Distt. Burdwan. The management filed its statement of case while for the workmen a statement of case was signed and verified by one T. N. Sukla, General Secretary of the Union named Colliery Mazdoor Congress (CR), Ushagram, P.O. Asansol. None of the workmen signed and verified such statement of case purported to be one filed by the General Secretary of the Union for the workmen. The management filed a rejoinder to the statement of case filed by the workmen. Ultimately the case was fixed for settling a date of hearing on 31-1-1973.

3. On 31-1-1973 it was observed in the order passed that the Colliery Mazdoor Congress, (C-R), Ushagram, was found in Reference Case No. 110 of 1971 (award already published) to be not a registered trade union. There was no letter of authority made and subscribed by the workmen involved in this reference authorising any of the office-bearers of the so called registered trade union to represent the workmen in this proceeding. The Colliery Mazdoor Congress (CR) being not a registered trade union, it cannot represent the workmen involved in this reference. Even if it was a registered trade union, in absence of any letter of authority made and subscribed by the workmen involved in this case authorising any of the office-bearers or members of the Executive of such trade union to represent them in this proceeding, it cannot represent the workmen involved in this reference. As the union itself was not a registered trade union as they had claimed to be, it cannot act in any manner in this proceeding as a representative of the workmen involved in this case in view of Section 36(1)(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act read with Rule 36 Form F of the Central Rules. Moreover, the statement of case, purported to be one for the workmen filed by the General Secretary of the so called registered trade union and signed and verified by him, contravened Rule 29 and Rule 10B(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957. So, for all these reasons the so called statement of case filed on behalf of the workmen by the union, the character of which was found in Reference Case No. 110 of 1971, could not be accepted. So, a general notice was sent to the management for publication in the colliery for information of the workmen asking them to appear individually or through a registered trade union in this proceeding. That notice was directed to be published in the colliery area by the management as widely as possible. Following the direction of the tribunal such notice as issued by the tribunal was published by the management in the colliery area (vide report of the management). But, on the date of hearing the management appeared but none of the workmen involved in this reference case appeared inspite of general notice published in the colliery area asking the workmen individually to appear in this proceeding or in the alternative, through a registered trade union, if they so desired.

4. For the management Mr. Narsingh pointed out that the dispute as referred for adjudication is not an industrial dispute. The issue as in the schedule to the order of reference reads as follows:

"Whether the demand of the Union that loaders of Chinakuri No. 3 Pit Colliery of Messrs. Bengal Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan, should not be forced to do the jobs of dressing, drilling and explosive carrying besides their job of loading is justified? If not, to what relief are the loaders concerned entitled and from which date?"

The demand of the loaders of Chinakuri No. 3 Pit Colliery of Messrs. Bengal Coal Company Limited was that the loaders should not be forced to do the job of dressing, drilling and explosive carrying besides their job of loading. The management, as the issue indicates, forced the loaders besides doing their job of loading the jobs of dressing, drilling and explosive carrying. The failure report of the Conciliation officer came along with the order of reference. In paragraph 1 of the report it says:

"The Vice-President, Colliery Mazdoor Congress (Cong.-R) raised an industrial dispute over alleged illegal and wrongful stoppage of work of U/G loaders by the management of Chinakuri No. 3 Pit Colliery of M/s. Bengal Coal Co. Ltd., from 1st shift of 17-4-72 vide his letter dated 20-4-72 (copy enclosed), and requested for intervention."

Mr. Narsingh appearing for the management pointed out that the demand in the issue referred to for adjudication and the demand that was laid before the conciliatory authority stood at poles as under. So, he submitted that the issue referred to for adjudication in the order of reference is hit by the principles laid down in the decision of Supreme Court in the case of Sindhu Resettlement Corporation Ltd. and Industrial Tribunal, Gujarat & Ors., 1968 L.J., p. 834 and in the decision of Delhi High Court in the case of Fedders Lloyd Corporation Private Ltd., and Lt. Governor, Delhi & Ors. F.L.R. 1970(20) p. 343. The Vice-President, Colliery Mazdoor Congress (C.R) raised the industrial dispute over

the alleged illegal and wrongful stoppage of work of underground loaders by the management of Chinakuri No. 3 Pit Colliery of Messrs. Bengal Coal Company Limited from 1st shift of 17-4-72 but the issue referred to for adjudication is what I have just quoted. Therefore, what was demanded on behalf of the workmen before the conciliatory authority is thoroughly inconsistent, incongruous and conflicting with the demand in the issue referred to for adjudication by this tribunal. So, on the very face of the record, the demand in the issue referred to for adjudication comes within the mischief of law laid down in the cases referred to above and as such the dispute in the issue referred to for adjudication is not an industrial dispute within Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

4. Therefore, I hold that the dispute being not an industrial dispute within Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act cannot be entertained and adjudicated upon by this tribunal. The reference is, therefore, rejected.

This is my award.

S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-19012/51/72-LR II.]

Dated June 23, 1973.

S.O. 2095.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Damoda Colliery, Post Office Raniganj, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7th July, 1973.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA.

Reference No. 61 of 1972

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Damoda Colliery,

AND

Their Workmen

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi.—Presiding Officer.

Appearances:

On behalf of Employers.—Sri Monoj Kumar Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Absent.

State : West Bengal

Industry : Coal Mine

AWARD

By Order No. L/19012/69/72-LR II, dated 26th October, 1972, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Damoda Colliery and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely :

"Keeping in view the relevant provisions of the Standing Orders certified for the Collieries, whether the action of the management of Damoda Colliery, Post Office Raniganj, District Burdwan, West Bengal, in denying permanency of employment to Sarvasbri Haranarayan Gosai, Underground Trimmer, Anant Singh, Timber Mazdoor and Joyram Keot, Line Mazdoor, is justified? If not, to what relief, if any, are these workmen entitled?"

2. In spite of notices duly served on the management and the union that claimed to raise the dispute referred to for adjudication by this tribunal, neither the management nor the workmen filed any statement of case. On 30-4-73 the management appeared through its learned Advocate but none appeared for the workmen. The case had been fixed for peremptory hearing on 27-6-73. On the date of hearing the management appeared through its learned Advocate Mr. Mukherjee but the workmen did not turn up. The learned Advocate for the management submitted that as the workmen had not appeared in spite of notice it might be presumed that there was no dispute and an award may be rendered accordingly.

3. The dispute referred to for adjudication is not an industrial dispute. In Reference Case No. 103 of 1971, award of which had been published in the Gazette of India, the Register of trade unions maintained by the Registrar of Trade Unions, West Bengal was called for by the management and was marked Ext. M14. There it was found that Colliery Mazdoor Sabha was registered on 15-7-55 bearing Sl. No. 3449. The Register further showed that the said union's registered head office is located at Jamuria, P. O. Jamuria, District Burdwan. It was found in that reference case that there is no registered trade union bearing registration Sl. No. 3449 with its registered head office either at Raniganj or at Asansol with the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha. Up to the date of the award in that reference case i.e. December, 1972, as was found in that award, a registered trade union bearing Sl. No. 3449 with its registered head office at Jamuria, P. O. Jamuria, District Burdwan exists by the name of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha. It was further found in that reference case that the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Sl. No. 3449 was not registered as a trade union having its head office at any place other than at Jamuria. In that reference case, a trade union bearing the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (CITU) with registration No. 3449 claimed to have its office at Raniganj and Asansol. That trade union of the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha affiliated to CITU bearing Sl. No. 3449 was found to be not identical with the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Sl. No. 3449 having its registered head office at Jamuria, P. O. Jamuria, District Burdwan. The Register of Trade Unions, Ext. M14, proved in that reference case is maintained under Sec. 8 of the Trade Unions Act in which any change of the head office of any registered trade union has to be recorded by the Registrar of Trade Unions in the manner discussed in that award. That is a statutory register to be maintained under the provisions of Trade Union law, and as such, is a public document, entries wherein are conclusive unless contrary is proved by any party controverting the same. I observed in that reference case vide award: "Looking into the register of trade unions, Ext. M14, I hold that it has been maintained upto date according to law by the Registrar of trade unions. Therefore, there is no registered trade union of the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Regd. Sl. No. 3449 having its any office, not to speak of its head office, either at Asansol or at Raniganj. The Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, bearing Regd. Sl. No. 3449 having its office at Asansol and Raniganj, Dist. Burdwan is not, therefore, a registered trade union under Section 8 of the Trade Unions Act read with Section 13 of that Act. Moreover, as there

cannot be in law two organisations of registered Trade Unions bearing the same name and the same registration serial number, one of such organisations must be a spurious one, having no legal existence as a registered trade union under Trade Unions Act". I am, therefore, bound by what I have already held in reference case No. 103 of 1971, the award of which was published in the gazette of India, Part II, Sec. 3(ii), p. 248, dated 20-1-1973. In this proceeding, the industrial dispute on behalf of the workmen was raised by Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (AITUC), Asansol vide its letter dated 13-6-72 before the A.L.C., Raniganj as appearing in the failure report attached to the memo of the order of reference forwarded to this tribunal. This Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, AITUC, Asansol, in view of the award published in Reference Case No. 103 of 1971, cannot be considered to be a registered trade union. The Organising Secretary of the said union who represented himself before the conciliatory authority as a member of the Executive of a registered trade union by the name of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (AITUC), having its registered office at Asansol perpetrated a fraud upon the Statutes such as the Trade Union Act, 1926 and the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The R.L.C., Raniganj, took it for granted that the Organising Secretary of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, AITUC, having its registered office at Asansol was the member of a Executive Committee of a duly registered trade union and accepting such representation made by such Organising Secretary of such a trade union assumed jurisdiction to conciliate in the dispute raised by such Organising Secretary on behalf of the workmen. The conciliation failed and on the failure report the Central Government exercised its jurisdiction under Sec. 10(1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act by referring the dispute for adjudication by this tribunal. But, it was found in the reference Case No. 103 of 1971 that this Colliery Mazdoor Sabha AITUC, claiming to have its registered office at Asansol is not in law a registered trade union. Therefore, by false representation the Organising Secretary of such a trade union made the R.L.C. Raniganj to believe that the dispute sponsored by the union on behalf of the workmen had been sponsored by a registered trade union acting through one of its member of the Executive of such a union i.e. the Organising Secretary when, however, the union was found in Reference case No. 103 of 1971 to be not a registered trade union. It is not a case that the dispute was raised by an unregistered trade union. If the trade union was not lawfully registered or being lawfully registered ceased to be so by its own act, it cannot claim to be a registered trade union. But if any member of the Executive of such a trade union represents before an authority like the Conciliatory authority in this case that he i.e. the Organising Secretary of the union was the Organising Secretary of a lawfully registered trade union, his representation was false and such false representation was a fraud on the Statute. Fraud vitiates everything. The proceeding before the Conciliatory authority relating to the conciliation of the dispute referred to for adjudication by this tribunal raised on behalf of the workmen by the Organising Secretary of the union was thus affected by the fraud of the Organising Secretary of the Union and, therefore, vitiated the entire proceeding. On the strength of the failure report the Central Government exercised jurisdiction to refer the dispute in question for adjudication by this tribunal. The dispute, if any, was thus affected by the fraud committed by the Organising Secretary of the union by representing that he was the

Organising Secretary of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, AITUC, Asansol, a registered trade union, when in fact and in law, it was not a registered trade union. Therefore, the dispute from the stage of conciliation proceeding right upto this stage stands vitiated by the fraud thus committed by the Organising Secretary of the union of the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, AITUC, Asansol, which had never been a registered trade union.

4. Accordingly, the dispute lost its character, being vitiated by fraud, upon the statutes, of an industrial dispute under Sec. 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act. So, this tribunal cannot entertain and adjudicate upon a dispute referred to it for adjudication which in tribunal's finding has been vitiated by fraud committed by the Organising Secretary of the union upon Statutes. So, the dispute is not an industrial dispute and cannot be entertained and adjudicated upon by this tribunal. In the result, the reference is rejected.

This is my award.

S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-19012/69/72-LR.II.]

Dated, June, 27, 1973.

S.O. 2096.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Manager, Lower Kenda Colliery (The Khas Kenda Colliery Private Limited), Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7th July, 1973.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA.

Reference No. 67 of 1972

Parties :

Employers in relation to the Manager, Lower Kenda Colliery,

AND

Their Workmen.

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi.—Presiding Officer.

Appearance :

On behalf of Employers.—Sri Monoj Kr. Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen.—Absent.

State : West Bengal Industry : Coal Mine

AWARD

By Order No. L/19012/93/72-LR.II, dated 8th November, 1972, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour

and Employment, referred the following dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Manager, Lower Kenda Colliery and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely :

"Whether the management of Lower Kenda Colliery (The Khas Kenda Colliery Private Limited) Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan are justified in stopping the work of Shri Subodh Kumar Mukherjee, Pump Khalasi with effect from the 4th August, 1972, if not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. Notices of the reference have been served upon the management and the workman through the Organising Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, P.O. Asansol, District Burdwan. Neither party filed any statement of case. On 30-4-73 Mr. Mukherjee, learned Advocate appeared for the management but none appeared for the workman. The case was fixed for hearing on 28-6-1973. The management appeared through its learned Advocate Mr. Mukherjee but none appeared for the workman.

3. The dispute is not an industrial dispute according to law. It has been held already in Reference Case No. 103 of 1971 (vide award already published in the Gazette of India) that the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, AITUC, P.O. Asansol, District Burdwan is not a registered trade union. The Organising Secretary of such an organisation purported to represent the workmen as a member of the executive of a registered trade union before the Conciliatory authority while the demand relating to the dispute had been laid by such Organising Secretary before the Conciliatory authority. The conciliation failed. Upon the conciliation report, the Central Government exercised jurisdiction to refer the dispute in the issue as constituted in the order of reference for adjudication by this tribunal. The Organising Secretary of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, AITUC, by his representation before the conciliatory authority that he was a member of the executive of a registered trade union committed fraud upon the Statutes i.e. the Indian Trade Unions Act, 1926 and the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Conciliatory authority as well as the management took it for granted that the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, AITUC, P.O. Asansol, Dist. Burdwan was a registered trade union and that the Organising Secretary of such an organisation was one of the members of the executives of such a lawfully registered trade union. But in fact and in law the trade union was found in Reference Case No. 103 of 1971 as being not a registered trade union wherefor the Organising Secretary was not a member of the executive of a registered trade union. The workman involved in the dispute was not, therefore, a member of a registered trade union. So, the fraud by false representation that was made by the Organising Secretary of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, AITUC, before the conciliatory authority vitiated the conciliation proceeding. That fraud affected the Central Government's action in deciding that an industrial dispute as constituted in the issue appearing in the order of reference did exist under the law, and thereupon referred the dispute for adjudication by this tribunal. Fraud vitiates everything. The dispute, that was sponsored by the Organising Secretary of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, acting as it were

that he was an office bearer of a registered trade union was thus vitiated by the fraud of the Organising Secretary of the said trade union, and the dispute, thereupon, lost its legal character as an industrial dispute.

4. Accordingly, this tribunal cannot entertain and adjudicate upon the dispute as an industrial dispute under Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Hence the reference is rejected.

This is my award.

Dated, 2nd July, 1973.

S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-19012/93/72-LR II]

New Delhi, the 13th July, 1973

S.O. 2097.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of North East Salanpur Colliery, Post Office Salanpur, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7th July, 1973.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 46 of 1972

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of North East Salanpur Colliery,

AND

Their Workmen.

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi—Presiding Officer.

Appearances :

On behalf of Employers—Sri Monoj Kr. Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Absent.

State : West Bengal

Industry : Coal Mine

AWARD

By Order No. L/19012/34/72-LR II, dated 21-7-1972, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred

the following dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of North East Salanpur Colliery and their workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, namely :—

“Whether the demand of the union for implementation in full of the Wage Board recommendations for the Coal Mining Industry as accepted by Government, by the management of North East Salanpur Colliery, Post Office Salanpur, District Burdwan, is justified? If so, what should be the wage structure and other benefits in respect of the workmen concerned and from what date?”

2. In this reference notices were issued to the management as well as to the workmen through the Organising Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (AITUC), G. T. Road, P. O. Asansol, Dist. Burdwan. The management filed its statement of case while the workmen, in spite of notice, and not file any statement of case. On the date of hearing the management appeared through its learned Advocate but none appeared for the workmen.

3. For the management Mr. Mukherjee, learned Advocate, submitted that the recommendations of the Wage Board for the Coal Mining Industry have no statutory force and that as such the employer was not legally obliged to accept and to act upon the same. He further submitted that the employer did not accept the recommendations and acted upon it. So, the reference as constituted does not involve an industrial dispute under Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act and as such this tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain and to adjudicate upon the same.

4. I fully accept the submission of the learned Advocate for the management. I hold that the reference does not involve any industrial dispute within Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, and as such cannot be entertained and adjudicated upon by this tribunal. The reference is, therefore, rejected.

This is my award.

Sd/-

S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer

[No. L-19012/34/72-LR II]

KARNAIL SINGH, Under Secy.

Dated, 2nd July, 1973.

नई दिल्ली, 24 जुलाई, 1973

New Delhi, the 24th July, 1973

का. आ. 2098.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को समाधान हो गया है कि लोक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि कोयला उद्योग, जो कि औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की पहली अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट है, उक्त अधिनियम, के प्रयोजनों के लिये एक लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया जाना है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (ब) के उपखण्ड (6) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 28 जुलाई, 1973 से छः मास की अवधि के लिये, एक लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है ।

[फा. सं. एस-11025/22/73-एल. आर.-1]

एस. एस. सहस्रनामन, अवर सचिव

S.O. 2098.—Whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the public interest requires that the coal industry which is specified in the First Schedule to the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), should be declared to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act for a period of six months with effect from the 28th of July, 1973.

[F. No. S-11025/22/73-LR.1]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.